

A Guide to Speedy Mail Service for Our Servicemen Overseas

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of my special concerns with regard to our military commitment in Vietnam is the necessity for the best possible mail service for our gallant servicemen.

Twice I have traveled to Vietnam to

see for myself the provisions over there for handling the mail. I must say that there was a big improvement between my two visits.

Most important in handling servicemen's mail after it reaches the mailbox is proper preparation of the mail by the sender. Such preparation can save a lot of delays and other frustrations on both ends.

I commend to my colleagues a new pamphlet which has been prepared by the Post Office Department for free distribution in some 40,000 post offices and branches across the Nation.

"Mail for Servicemen: A Guide for Speeding Service" is a handy pamphlet that clearly explains the rules and rates.

There are details on the three services for airlifting parcels at rates the average family can afford, the speedy service now available for newspapers and news magazines to most overseas bases, the special rates for books and other educational materials, and how to mail sound-recorded personal messages.

Referring to the new services available, Postmaster General O'Brien said he hopes the new "guide will help more American families be familiar with these services and use them."

SENATE—Tuesday, March 19, 1968

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian and was called to order by Hon. ALBERT GORE, a Senator from the State of Tennessee.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God, our Father, from the tumult of an angry, agitated world, we seek the sanctuary of Thy presence, not that we may escape from the world, but that we may turn to the perplexing maze of its tangled problems with strong spirits and quiet minds.

From the shams and shadows of these days, we pray for strength for our burdens, wisdom for our problems, insight for our times, and vision which sets our eyes on far horizons. And, above all and in all, undergird our faith with the conquering assurance that—

Under the shadow of Thy throne still may we dwell secure,
Sufficient is Thine arm alone, and our defense is sure.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., March 19, 1968.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. ALBERT GORE, a Senator from the State of Tennessee, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. GORE thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings on Monday, March 18, 1968, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on March 16, 1968, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 2419) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, with respect to the development of cargo container vessels, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,
The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Lt. Gen. Jack G. Merrell (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade of general while so serving, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following committee and subcommittees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

The Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations.

The Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures of the Committee on Government Operations.

The Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution of the Committee on Public Works.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, reporting, pursuant to law, on the extraordinary contractual adjustments and actions taken under project stabilization agreements, during the calendar year 1967; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

REPORT ON AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM

A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report on the Agricultural Conservation Program for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PROPOSED EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY OF DOMESTIC BANKS TO PAY INTEREST ON TIME DEPOSITS OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS AT RATES DIFFERING FROM THOSE APPLICABLE TO DOMESTIC DEPOSITORS

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the authority of domestic banks to pay interest on time deposits of foreign governments at rates differing from those applicable to domestic depositors (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PROPOSED INCREASE IN NUMBER OF OFFICERS FOR THE COAST GUARD

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to increase the limitation on number of officers for the Coast Guard (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO CONFLICTS OF INTEREST, WITH RESPECT TO MEMBERS OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COUNCIL

A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting a draft of pro-

posed legislation to amend title 18, United States Code, relating to conflicts of interest, with respect to the members of the District of Columbia Council (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PROPOSED DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ZONING LEGISLATION

A letter from the Assistant to the Commissioner, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend "An act providing for the zoning of the District of Columbia and the regulation of the location, height, bulk, and uses of buildings and other structures and of the use of land in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1938, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on omission of facilities for metering electricity in individual dwelling units proposed to reduce construction costs of low-rent public housing projects, Department of Housing and Urban Development (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

ANNUAL AUDIT OF THE FOUNDATION OF THE FEDERAL BAR ASSOCIATION

A letter from the Secretary of the Board of Directors, the Foundation of the Federal Bar Association, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual audit of the association for the fiscal year ended September 30, 1967 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF BOYS' CLUBS OF AMERICA

A letter from the president, Boys' Clubs of America, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of an audited financial statement of the club for the year ended December 31, 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Finance:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 2

"Relative to federal participation in aid to families with dependent children program

"Whereas, After June 30, 1968, the federal government will not participate in aid to families with dependent children payments to children under 18 years of age on aid because of the absence of a parent, beyond those represented by the proportion of such children to the state's total child population under 18 years of age as of January 1, 1968; and

"Whereas, Any increase in the number of children under 18 years on such aid without a proportionate increase in the state's total child population under 18 years of age after June 30, 1968, would place the entire financial burden for such increase on the state and counties; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to rescind the recent legislation limiting the federal government after June 30, 1968, from participating in aid to families with dependent children payments to children under 18 years

of age on aid because of the absence of a parent, beyond those represented by the proportion of such children to the state's total child population under 18 years of age as of January 1, 1968; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution adopted by the Order Sons of Italy in America, Lodge No. 487, Binghamton, N.Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to declare the Garibaldi-Meucci Memorial Museum, Staten Island, N.Y., a national historical landmark; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE ON THE JANUARY 1968 ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT—STATEMENT OF COMMITTEE AGREEMENT, MINORITY AND OTHER VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 1016)

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, the Employment Act of 1946, section 5(b) (3), requires that the Joint Economic Committee, not later than March 1 of each year, shall file a report containing its findings and recommendations with respect to each of the main recommendations made by the President in the Economic Report. This year the date for filing the committee's report was extended to March 22 by Public Law 90-250, dated January 24.

I therefore submit, from the Joint Economic Committee, a report entitled "1968 Joint Economic Report," and ask unanimous consent that this report may be printed together with the statement of committee agreement, minority and other views.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Wisconsin.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts:

S. 3185. A bill for the relief of Antoni de Januszkowski and Maurice Lemee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF:

S. 3186. A bill to provide for Federal participation in the cost of improvements to streets and appurtenant facilities at the Army Reserve facilities in Helena, Mont.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. METCALF (for himself, Mr. BURDICK, and Mr. MOSS):

S. 3187. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, in order to authorize loans under such act to be made in the territory of Guam without regard to certain limitation prescribed by such act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 3188. A bill for the relief of Michael D. Manemann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FONG:

S. 3189. A bill for the relief of Frank Shih-Heng Cheng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JORDAN of Idaho:

S. 3190. A bill for the relief of Jose Anchastequi;

S. 3191. A bill for the relief of Pablo Garay; and

S. 3192. A bill for the relief of Jose Magaregui; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S.J. Res. 155. Joint resolution to designate April 21-27, as "Discover America Vacation Planning Time"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 155—INTRODUCTION OF JOINT RESOLUTION TO DESIGNATE APRIL 21-27 AS "DISCOVER AMERICA VACATION PLANNING TIME"

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution designating the period April 21-27, 1968, as "Discover America Vacation Planning Time." This joint resolution would encourage Americans and citizens from abroad to enjoy the opportunities for travel within the United States. It recognizes the value both as an economic force and as a means of appreciating our national heritage. And it stresses the need for thoughtful planning to achieve a meaningful "Discover America" vacation.

On this occasion there is one point that should be made: America is worth discovering. Every region of this country has magnificent natural wonders, inspiring historical landmarks, and fascinating cities and towns. We have an outstanding transportation system and some of the world's best facilities and services. No one should take this for granted, and no one should pass up the opportunities that are awaiting the well-prepared vacationing traveler.

Americans love to travel. During the summer, on our highways and around our great travel attractions, citizens from every State mingle in the adventure of travel. Proof of this is seen in the commingling of auto license plates from every State.

We are also a major travel attraction to visitors from foreign nations. In 1967, we hosted nearly 1.5 million business and pleasure visitors from abroad. In addition, 423,000 visitors came to see us from Mexico and an estimated 7 million from Canada.

Certainly we see a lot of vacation travel here in America, and we are better off because of it. Even so, we need a Discover America resolution. First, we need it because planning is necessary to make the best use of the facilities and services available; second, because far too many Americans have not yet really discovered this great country of ours. Further, this very resolution can go far in stimulating travel related companies and organizations to tie-in with a supporting travel promotion campaign which will have added significance in view of the Nation's balance-of-payments travel deficit.

I do not think any one will argue with the fact that planning pays off in long-remembered vacation experiences. But let us look at the second reason for this

resolution; the limited travel of many Americans within their own country.

In an annual publication of travel statistics in America, Mr. William D. Patterson said that 80 million Americans took no holiday or business trip of any kind.

This disturbing figure was underlined in testimony before the House Committee on Ways and Means on February 29, 1968, by Robert E. Short, chairman of Discover America. He cited the findings of his organization that from the standpoint of our travel habits, that we were divided into four distinct regions and that too few of our citizens move from region to region. He stated that more people left the northeastern part of the country for foreign destinations than the number who found their way from that region across the Rocky Mountains. The reverse proposition was equally true: many more people traveled out of the country from the West than within the country from the West to the East.

Mr. Short also cited the limited movement of our people between the North and the South. But what surprised me most was what he had to say about our travel habits on a smaller scale. According to a "Discover America" survey, over half of our people have never been further away from home than 200 miles. Over half of them have never stayed overnight in a hotel. And less than 20 percent of the people have ever flown on a commercial airliner.

I have called attention to these figures to show the tremendous potential for enlarging the travel experience of millions of Americans. Beyond that, there are millions of potential visitors in foreign lands waiting for the opportunity to come and see us.

I hope that this information will promote more beneficial travel to and within our Nation. America is waiting to be discovered again and again by those who will plan now. I urge the prompt approval of the "Discover America Vacation Planning Time" joint resolution.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 155) to designate April 21-27, as "Discover America Vacation Planning Time," introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1567) to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, as amended, to provide an alternate method of making loans for acquisition and improvements of the farm, needed by farm families, including young farmers, and to provide borrower family with adequate standards of living and the consumer with reasonable prices for dairy and other

agricultural products, as well as to maintain and improve national health; and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTANA] be added as a cosponsor of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 150) to designate the month of May 1968 as "National Arthritis Month."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESOLUTIONS

The following resolutions were submitted or reported and referred as indicated:

REFERENCE OF SENATE BILL 3185 TO COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 267); which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. Res. 267

Resolved, That S. 3185 entitled "A bill for the relief of Antoni de Januszkowski and Maurice Lemee" together with all accompanying papers is hereby referred to the chief commissioner of the Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, for further proceedings in accordance with applicable law.

REFERENCE OF SENATE BILL 3188 TO COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. ALLOTT submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 268); which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. Res. 268

Resolved, That the bill (S. 3188) entitled "A bill for the relief of Michael D. Mane-mann", now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the chief commissioner of the Court of Claims, and the chief commissioner of the Court of Claims shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, and report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

SENATORIAL STANDARDS OF CONDUCT—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 629

Mr. CLARK submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the resolution (S. Res. 266) to provide standards of conduct for Members of the Senate and officers and employees of the Senate, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 630

Mr. CANNON submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate Resolution 266, supra, which were or-

dered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 631 THROUGH 633

Mr. CURTIS submitted three amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate Resolution 266, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 634

Mr. MUNDT submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate resolution 266, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 635 AND 636

Mr. DODD submitted two amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate resolution 266, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON INTERNATIONAL GRAINS ARRANGEMENT OF 1967

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the ad hoc subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations appointed to consider the International Grains Arrangement—an ad hoc subcommittee which I chair—will begin hearings on the Arrangement on Tuesday, March 26. Under Secretary of Agriculture John A. Schnitzler and Ambassador William M. Roth, the President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, will testify on March 26 and, if necessary, on March 27. Other witnesses will be heard on April 4 and, if necessary, on April 5 as well.

The hearing on March 26 will begin at 11 a.m. The hearings on other days will begin at 10 a.m. All hearings will be held in room 4221, New Senate Office Building.

Individuals wishing to testify, who have not already communicated with the Committee on Foreign Relations, should contact Mr. Arthur M. Kuhl, chief clerk of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUPPORT OF AMERICA'S LABOR MOVEMENT FOR HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS HAS NEVER WAVED

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, the rights embodied in the human rights conventions on forced labor, political rights of women, freedom of association and genocide are as native to America as the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. Much of the energy and support for the United Nations itself came from the United States. The person who had the most influence in framing the U.N.'s Declaration of Human Rights was a great American—Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt.

This pattern of American inspiration of and leadership in the fight for human rights is clearly seen in the history of the Convention on Forced Labor.

This convention is a direct outgrowth of an inquiry initiated by the American Federation of Labor with the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. The A.F. of L., in 1947, asked for a complete investigation concerning forced labor and the consideration of action to abolish it.

Labor's support for this and other human rights conventions has been continuous. Jacob Clayman, the administrative director, Industrial Unions Department, testified last spring for the AFL-CIO before the Dodd subcommittee. He said:

We come forward in support of the United Nations Conventions now before this Ad Hoc Subcommittee to assert and affirm in a few words the interest and concern of American workers in the building of a more effective moral foundation for national and world justice and humanitarianism.

Mr. President, I urge the Senate to heed the example of labor, of great leaders like the late Eleanor Roosevelt, of our own history. I call upon the Senate to ratify the Convention Concerning the Abolition of Forced Labor and the Convention on the Political Rights of Women.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

JOHN VANCE APPROPRIATE CHOICE FOR CHAIRMAN OF THE INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I am delighted that the President has designated John Vance, of Helena, Mont., as Chairman of the Indian Claims Commission.

Prior to becoming a member of the Commission last year, Mr. Vance served as a visiting professor of law at the University of North Dakota. He served 9 years as counsel of the Montana Trade Commission, as city attorney in our hometown of Helena, and as deputy county attorney in Missoula County.

Mr. Vance brought to his present position a scholar's knowledge of Indian affairs and Western history. That knowledge, coupled with his legal experience and administrative ability, indicates to me, and I am sure to the other members of the Senate Interior Committee who have discussed Commission affairs with him, that under his chairmanship the Commission will provide just and timely resolution of the complicated issues before it.

BLUE RIBBON COMMISSION TO STUDY VIETNAM PROBLEM

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I would like to speak briefly on an important matter that deserves serious consideration but apparently has fallen victim to the highly charged political pressures and recriminations under which it was proposed and rejected.

I speak of the suggestion of the appointment by the President of a blue ribbon commission or panel to study the Vietnam problem. I think the suggestion is worthy of serious consideration and

that it should be reconsidered rather than to fall victim to the conflict of intense political motivations, ambitions, and maneuvers.

I would hope that the President would give serious consideration to the appointment of such a commission with a composition that would be free of being suspect of any political motivations.

To attain such a membership, I would suggest that the President appoint men and women whose motives are not suspect by selecting only those who do not hold public office, elective or appointive, and who do not seek any public office.

I would suggest the consideration of past Presidents, who not only have dealt with wars in Asia, specifically Korea and Vietnam, but who are retired. I would suggest the consideration of past Secretaries of State and Defense who are retired and hold no public office.

I would suggest representatives from various segments of the American public, who have not assumed the posture of either a "hawk" or a "dove" and have not been identified as militants either for escalation or for unilateral withdrawal.

Were I President, I would welcome the observations and advice of such a commission in which I am confident the American people would have faith and trust—much more than in the current adversaries of the dialog.

RECEPTION TOMORROW IN VANDENBERG ROOM FOR OFFICIALS OF REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the visit to the United States of some distinguished visitors from the Republic of Korea and to invite the Members of the Senate to a reception for these visitors in the Vandenberg Room at 3 o'clock tomorrow, Wednesday, March 20. Gen. Im Chung Sik, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Republic of Korea, accompanied by his wife; Maj. Gen. Lew Byong Hion, Director of Operations and Plans Bureau, Joint Chiefs of Staff, Republic of Korea; and Lt. Col. Shin Yong Seong, administrative assistant to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Republic of Korea, are here as guests of Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the United States.

These officers are to be commended for the outstanding record of the Republic of Korea military forces, especially for the record of the Republic of Korea Forces Vietnam. Many of the Members of Congress and staff have met these officers either in Korea or in Vietnam. General Lew, prior to his assignment to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, was the commanding general of the Capital-Tiger-Division of the Republic of Korea Forces Vietnam, from August 9, 1966, to September 20, 1967.

Lt. Col. Zetta Jones, Army liaison in the House, and Lt. Col. Dorothy Manning, Army liaison in the Senate, who are the escort officers for the visit of these guests to the Capitol, may be contacted for any further information about their visit.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a news release from the De-

partment of Defense concerning these distinguished officers of the Republic of Korea be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the news release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VISIT OF GEN. IM CHUNG SIK, CHAIRMAN, JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF, REPUBLIC OF KOREA

An Armed Forces full honor arrival ceremony will be held for General Im Chung Sik, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, Republic of Korea, at the River Entrance of the Pentagon at 11:15 a.m. on Tuesday, March 19.

Visiting the United States as the guest of General Earle G. Wheeler, USA, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Im will be accompanied by Mrs. Im and Major General Lew Byong Hion, Director, Operations and Plans Bureau, Joint Chiefs of Staff, Republic of Korea, and Senior ROK Member of United Nations Command Military Armistice Commission.

Immediately following the arrival ceremony at the Pentagon, General Im will call on General Wheeler at 11:30 a.m. That afternoon he will visit Arlington National Cemetery at 3 p.m. for wreath ceremonies at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier and at the grave of former President John F. Kennedy. While in Washington General Im also will call on Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul H. Nitze and Vice Admiral Luther C. Heinz, Director of Military Assistance, and visit the National War College and the U.S. Capitol.

General Im will visit U.S. Army Continental Army Command at Fort Monroe, Virginia; Commander-in-Chief, Atlantic, headquarters at Norfolk, Virginia; Niagara Falls, New York; New York City and the United Nations; the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, New York; U.S. Air Force Academy and North American Air Defense Command at Colorado Springs, Colorado; Los Angeles and Headquarters Sixth U.S. Army at San Francisco.

On March 30 General Im and his party will depart San Francisco for Hawaii enroute to Seoul.

JURISDICTION OF THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, in a statement which recently appeared in the Washington Post, Miss Betty Furness, special assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs, was extremely critical of S. 1365, a bill introduced by my distinguished colleague from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and me to amend the Federal Power Act with respect to the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission.

Miss Furness called it a "backward step" for consumers.

The proposed legislation would exempt purely intrastate electric companies and REA cooperatives from the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission. The question that comes to mind is: "What consumer is she talking about?"

I testified before the Committee on Commerce that it had been disclosed that large additional costs and initial and continuing expenses would be incurred by the Florida companies in being forced to comply with the burdensome and unnecessary requirements of FPC. Such additional costs would necessarily be borne by the consumer.

As I pointed out at that time, rather than this measure being a bill which would be classified as favorable to the power company, the fact is that it is a measure in the interest of consumers.

Under such circumstances, I question whether Miss Furness represents the consumer in this matter, or the FPC, in what I believe to be a bureaucratic grab for power and authority.

The Miami Herald of June 15, 1967, published an editorial entitled "Power Grabbing and the Feds." This editorial succinctly examines the FPC's power grab and the resulting unfavorable impact on consumers because of the additional costs should it be successful in preventing the passage of this measure.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

POWER-GRABBING AND THE FEDS

A million Floridians will pay the cost—and get nothing—if bureaucrats in Washington succeed in forcing the Florida Power & Light Co. to do extra bookkeeping.

The million are FP&L customers from Live Oak and Callahan on the north, all down the East Coast to Florida City and along the Gulf Coast from Bradenton to Naples.

"The unnecessary added costs will be loaded on the backs of our customers because they are our only source of income," FP&L President Robert H. Fite told the Senate Commerce Committee this month.

The issue is a Senate bill which would exempt electric companies operating wholly inside one state from the supervision of the Federal Power Commission. There was no question on this score until last March. Then the FPC voted 3-to-2 to seize jurisdiction over the Florida utility firm.

A dissenting commissioner flatly accused the FPC majority of trying to enlarge its power. The attempt, he added, "objectively usurps the prerogatives of Congress."

The futility of the FPC gesture was made clear in Mr. Fite's testimony: "The Federal Power Act specifically prohibits regulation of retail rates by the FPC. Approximately 99 per cent of our revenue is from retail customers served under retail rates, and by no stretch of the present law could be considered subject to regulation by the FPC."

"The remaining one per cent of revenue—something less than \$3 million per year—is derived from wholesale contracts for electric power sold to Rural Electric Cooperatives which, in turn, resell it to their retail customers."

Thus, the FPC's "power grab," as we called it last March, would accomplish nothing except to let the federal agency oversee the contracts between the FP&L and the seven REA's. For that doubtful gain FP&L's million customers would have to pay \$4 to \$6 million for preparing original cost statements of the utility's property for the FPC, according to Mr. Fite's estimate.

Then there would be yearly expenses of more than \$500,000 for 57 new employees required to keep FP&L records for the FPC. And taxpayers all over the country, including Floridians, would foot the bill for FPC regulation of the company—"every telephone call, every letter and report, every expense account of a traveling auditor sent to Miami to review our accounting work," as Mr. Fite put it.

If it takes an act of Congress to put the FPC back in its place, we're for it.

DEATH OF WILLIAM SCHNADER

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I am deeply saddened by the death of my close friend, William Schnader, who passed away yesterday morning. As attorney general for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania under the administrations of

Governor Pinchot and Gov. John Fisher, he became known for his energy and love of hard work. Before his death, at the age of 81, he worked almost daily in his law office. He was a prime mover for revision of the Pennsylvania constitution and an architect of the Philadelphia home rule charter.

He was a past president of the Pennsylvania Bar Association, and president of the National Association of Attorneys General. In 1961, he was awarded the gold medal of the American Bar Association, its highest honor.

He has been an active and effective leader in Pennsylvania and in the Nation. His death leaves a void which will not be easily filled.

PROGRESS IN HUMANE CARE FOR LABORATORY ANIMALS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter I received from Dr. Irving G. Cashell, V.M.D., regarding Public Law 89-544, the Laboratory Animal Welfare Act, be printed in the Record.

Dr. Cashell's letter sums up the evolving and efficient enforcement of this law, and makes one very important point; the taxpayer will receive remarkable dividends from the humane treatment for laboratory animals because research results obtained from the use of healthy animals are far more dependable.

Congress made a very wise decision to place the inspection and enforcement of Public Law 89-544 in the hands of the experienced veterinarians of the Department of Agriculture, whose Animal Health Division has inspected each of the 182 licensed dealers, and 50 percent of the research facilities at least once.

With the relatively limited appropriation funds at their disposal, these dedicated men have instituted a far-reaching program of inspection and enforcement to insure that the act, as passed almost unanimously by the Congress, is carried out to the letter and intent.

I salute them for their efficient implementation of Public Law 89-544, and I thank Dr. Cashell for his succinct summation of their activities as of March 1968.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
March 12, 1968.

Senator A. S. MIKE MONRONEY,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONRONEY: I have followed with interest events leading to enactment of the Laboratory Animal Welfare Act, P. L. 89-544, to which you gave such essential impetus. Now I would like to comment on the evolving enforcement of the Act.

As of March, 1968, the Animal Health Division has inspected each of the 182 licensed dealers at least once; and some have been inspected several times.

Fifty per cent of the research facilities have been inspected at least once. There are 532 research facilities registered under the law, and they have 1,500 inspection sites.

Fifteen research facilities have asked for extension of time to get into compliance with the requirements of the law.

All complaints of possible violations have been followed up on.

Field personnel have submitted eighteen

cases for review for prosecution. Of these, nine are being developed for prosecution.

Fifteen dealers have gone out of business rather than attempt to make the improvements they would have to make for compliance with the law and regulations.

Some contacts have been made with auctions and Trade Days, but these have been limited.

Under the direction of Earl M. Jones, D.V.M., this has been accomplished with the limited appropriation made to initiate the program.

Over the years veterinary medicine in the U.S. Department of Agriculture has developed the control of infectious diseases of animals of economic importance. It has carried out the inspection of meat animals and meat for human consumption, and enforced the humane laws regulating the manner of transporting livestock interstate.

The taxpayers are little aware of the remarkable dividends returned on this relatively small investment. I am sure that the veterinarian administered law requiring the humane treatment of laboratory animals will be as efficiently invoked. Again the dividends will be substantial. We will know that laboratory animals are humanely cared for. We will know that research results utilizing healthy animals will be far more dependable.

With so many tax dollars going into biomedical research, we must support this law.

Sincerely,

IRVING G. CASHELL, V.M.D.

INCREASED RICE PRODUCTION IN THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, when Philippine President Ferdinand Marcos took office in 1966, he began immediately to attack the problems which had frustrated development efforts in that country for many years. With the help of our foreign aid program, President Marcos has brought about many important changes during the first 2 years of his administration. He has stressed self-help by his country, reduced government spending, attacked smuggling and tax violations, appointed capable administrators to government posts, and begun a program of land reform and rural development with initial concentration on 11 key rice-producing provinces.

One of the most notable achievements of the Marcos administration is that, for the first time in some 50 years, the Philippines are growing enough rice for their own consumption. This self-sufficiency in rice is the result of hard work of the Philippine farmers and the introduction of IR-8, a new miracle rice which can produce as much as five times the average Philippine crop. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an editorial published in the Washington Daily News of February 24, 1968, which comments on this advancement.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

IR-8, Etc.

We admit a nation seems to have a better chance of making a headline by having troubles instead of curing them. But here's one unsung progress report that ought to be sung. It is that the Philippines, in the scant two years since President Ferdinand E. Marcos took office, has wiped out its half-century of dependence upon the import of rice (the basic foodstuff) and now is developing a comfortable surplus. It's a real triumph, the kind of thing the world needs more of if

it is to avoid widespread misery in years ahead as populations soar.

Filipinos give special credit to IR-8, a new "miracle" rice strain developed from a long Indonesian and short Taiwanese variety. Where introduced, it has produced as much as five times the average Philippine crop, enough to boost the national crop 10 per cent in a year.

It took more than IR-8 alone, however. It took farm extension workers to spread the word and the do-it-yourself kits (seed, fertilizer, insecticides) to farmers. It took a government that provided more local irrigation and built more feeder roads. It took a network of reinvigorated rural banks to grant crop loans. And it took a determined president who ramrodded the whole show, including a one-third rise in the rice price to give farmers greater incentive to produce.

Some Americans had a hand in this, too. The Ford and Rockefeller foundations supported the Rice Research Institute. The U.S. Agency for International Development pumped money into the rural banks. And American businessmen expanded their fertilizer and insecticide production (and profits).

But the key man was the Filipino farmer. As Dr. Dioscoro Lopez Umali, the Philippines' Under Secretary of Agriculture, put it: "Rice cannot be grown in a cabinet meeting, or in a bank, or in an agriculture store. It can only be grown by farmers." Provided with IR-8 and the important "et ceteras," they are making their country self-sufficient in rice.

Congratulations are due to all hands. We hope people in other food-deficient countries, especially in Asia, will follow the Philippine example.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM S. GAUD, JR., ADMINISTRATOR OF AID

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, on last Friday the New York Times, in its "Man in the News" column, featured a public servant of vast ability who holds down one of this Capital's toughest jobs. He does it ably, as he has performed other tasks throughout his life. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this profile of Administrator William S. Gaud, Jr., of the Agency for International Development, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 15, 1968]
BLUNT AID DIRECTOR—WILLIAM STEEN GAUD, JR.

A short time ago, during one of those "wasting-the-taxpayers-money" waves that frequently wash over the Agency for International Development, mission heads in 70 nations around the world got a typically blunt message from their boss that began:

"I am sick and tired and I trust you are, too, of reading reports by visitors of idle or misplaced A.I.D.-financed supplies and equipment, of A.I.D.-built schools without teachers, hospitals without electricity, and so forth. The recurring question is, how can visitors find these situations if our own technicians, auditors and mission managers are doing their jobs?"

The question would have been sharper and the language much saltier—"full of all the commonly-used, four-letter superlatives," according to an aide—if William Steen Gaud Jr. had been addressing those mission chiefs across his desk in Washington.

Known among the 14,000 A.I.D. employees for his blunt tongue as well as his command of the details of his complex job, Mr. Gaud (pronounced Gowd) moved on yesterday to win the grudging respect of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for his detailed,

point-by-point presentation of the Johnson Administration's plans for foreign aid spending.

Mr. Gaud, an official of the agency since 1961 and director since August, 1966, is by now a veteran of the continuing war with Congress over appropriations for such overseas programs as population control, agricultural development and education.

"We go through these cliff-hangers every year," he said.

RUSK COMRADE IN WAR

In 1967, at the height of that year's battle over foreign aid appropriations, he said:

"What is needed for continuing public and Congressional support of foreign aid is a basic and general understanding that the built-in determination of the people of underdeveloped countries to improve their condition is a paramount fact of world affairs."

Mr. Gaud was brought into the agency by a World War II comrade-in-arms, Dean Rusk. Both served in New Delhi as Army colonels—first under Gen. Joseph W. Stilwell and later under the China-Burma-India command. Mr. Gaud's job was to direct military lend-lease aid to China.

Messmates and colleagues, they formed in India a mutual respect and fondness that led Mr. Gaud to offer his services to the State Department as soon as Mr. Rusk was made Secretary by President Kennedy. The offer was enthusiastically accepted.

Mr. Gaud, a lifelong Democrat, was not without Government experience. Immediately after the war he had served as special assistant to Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson. And before the war he was an assistant corporation counsel under Mayor La Guardia in New York.

One of his chief tasks was to handle the complex negotiations and court battles that followed the city's takeover of the I.R.T. subway line. Mr. La Guardia was so impressed with his skills in this and other assignments that he listed Mr. Gaud as one of the 11 men he thought qualified to succeed him as Mayor.

RAISED IN CHARLESTON

Though Mr. Gaud was born Aug. 9, 1907, in New York City, his soft Southern speech belies that origin. The explanation is that he was born while his parents—South Carolinians—were on a brief visit to the city. The family returned to Carolina and William Steen was raised in Charleston, where his father had established the Gaud School for Boys.

Educated in that school and later at one in Asheville, N.C., he studied for one year at the College of Charleston and then transferred to Yale, winning his B.A. degree in 1929 and his law degree, cum laude, in 1933.

Mr. Gaud elected to seek his fortune in New York and joined a city law firm. Two years later, after marrying Eleanor Mason Smith a Staten Island girl, he left the firm to begin his service for Mayor La Guardia.

The Gauds have one daughter, Anne, who was graduated from Vassar College last year with a major in Spanish. Though the family maintains a voting address in Greenwich, Conn., they sold their house there—a rambling, stucco residence, and now live the year round in the Spring Valley section of Washington.

During the spring and summer the Gauds will spend most weekends sailing in Chesapeake Bay on their 32-foot sloop, racing and tennis, usually fast games of doubles, are their chief recreations.

Just under six feet tall, of medium build, with sandy red hair, dark-rimmed glasses and conservatively cut suits enlivened by an occasionally adventurous tie, Mr. Gaud looks as he strides down the corridors of his agency like a tough administrator with a tough job. His aides say that's what he is and what he does well.

"THE LUCK OF THE IRISH"—AN ESSAY

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, in this season of St. Patrick's Day there are very few Americans who are willing to deny that there is a bit of the Irish in them, in spirit at least.

Mrs. Elizabeth Wilson Herer of Bucksport, Maine, recently sent me an essay about the Irish which explains, I think, our affection for the Irish and our respect for their deeds.

I ask unanimous consent that Mrs. Herer's essay appear in the RECORD at this time.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LUCK OF THE IRISH

(By Mrs. Elizabeth Wilson Herer)

The honor of the Irish is as good as his word. To them sin is a poor idea as they obey the law. The patriotism for their country is as fresh and verdant as the green grass of Ireland. Their expressions of good will, kind wishes, etc., affect scores of people.

The Irish are a nostalgic race of people who hold dear the memories of their childhood which gives them life and vigor. They gain much of their strength through knowledge and in being apt. Their verse—color is among the best of any land, and is read in the literature of the English-speaking world. They love poetry so much, that some of them even swear that God was a poet.

The rainbow is their love and the blue iris their flower. In this country, we often nickname it the blue flag. To them, real is what counts and he that can break a bad condition on the country or the people, becomes a great man of bravery, as did St. Patrick, the patron saint of Ireland.

To the Irish, St. Patrick stands for the young in heart, the endurance of the working people; their jealousies and great strength; their love of Christ and a wholesome life and for the natural ways of children. He is supposed to have driven all of the poisonous snakes out of Ireland; actually it had to do with a potato famine.

The Shamrock belongs to Ireland. It is a symbol of good luck or I wish you good luck. I do wish you good luck on this fine day.

FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the Arkansas Valley Journal has served the people of Arkansas Valley, Colo., well for many years. The paper is located in one of the great agricultural areas of my State, and its high quality of service is well known to me and to the people of the Arkansas Valley.

In keeping with its tradition of public service, the Arkansas Valley Journal salutes another fine institution of public service, the Future Farmers of America. I wish to add my commendation of the FAA and the fine work it does to the one so well expressed by the editorial entitled, "We Join Salute to FFA Program, Boys," published in the February 22, 1968, issue of the Arkansas Valley Journal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE JOIN SALUTE TO FFA PROGRAM, BOYS

This is National Future Farmers of America Week.

Each year it is celebrated during the week of George Washington's birthday because General Washington was not only the Father of his Country, but also the Father of a lot of the concepts of modern agriculture.

There are 450,000 members of the Future Farmers of America, and in this fine group of young men is the future of the food supply of our country, and to a great extent of the world.

Many of these boys will be operating farms and ranches in a few years, and making very practical use of the lessons they learned in their High School vo-ag classes and with their FFA farming projects.

Others will be in kindred occupations, many going on to two years in our fine junior colleges or for a full 4 year course with Ag major at Colorado State University or some of the other good "cow colleges" in adjacent states.

Demand for graduating ag majors in government service, extension, as teachers, in the Soil Conservation Service, the Forest Service and government research at state and national levels, and in private business, as field men, researchers, technicians, is much greater than the supply, and graduating ag majors can pick and choose among very attractive job offers.

A very large proportion of the ag majors get their start in the FFA programs and then go on to more advanced study.

Nothing is more important to the future welfare of the nation than its food supply, and the part that these FFA boys are going to play in assuring a continuing adequate food supply for the nation is what makes FFA so important.

The program also stresses leadership skills, public speaking, parliamentary procedure, and community service, and this is a wise program, because in the years ahead as still fewer and fewer people on the farms feed more and more people in the cities, it's going to require ever more sophisticated rural leadership to keep the Metropolitan areas from taking over politically, totally.

So we are happy to join in this nation wide salute to a fine program and a fine bunch of young men.

A DESPERATELY NEEDED INVESTMENT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on February 29, when I introduced the Emergency Employment Act of 1968, I stated that the crux of our spreading urban crisis is "the terrible frustration that men and women find in the dead end of poverty and joblessness." I said that the combination of poverty and persistent unemployment creates an eroding sense of hopelessness "and hopelessness can be the torch to ignite the dynamite lying beneath every municipal surface."

The legislation I introduced is designed as a major step in the eradication of that hopelessness—the kind of hopelessness that says "We have nothing to lose" and unleashes storms of fire, violence, and pillage to rage through our city streets. The legislation I offered is designed to create, over a 4-year period, 2,400,000 jobs among America's hard-core unemployed. It is designed to eradicate some of the ghettos of the mind, ghettos of desperation, ghettos of hopelessness.

The importance of this objective is increasingly understood by the shapers of American thought and by the various media. A provocative and perceptive understanding of my new emergency em-

ployment legislation was broadcast to the people of Pennsylvania on March 4 in a commentary by Peter W. Duncan, editorial director of WCAU-TV in Philadelphia. Because the editorial deserves to be read by Members of Congress and the largest possible number of Americans, I ask consent that Peter Duncan's commentary, entitled "A Desperately Needed Investment," be placed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the commentary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Last Thursday's report to the President from the National Commission on Civil Disorders reemphasized, among other things, the desperate need for more jobs in the areas of hard core unemployed.

On the same day, Senator Joseph Clark introduced the Emergency Employment and Training Act of 1968. Senator Clark's legislation calls for jobs and job training for 2,400,000 hard core unemployed during the next four years. This is the Senator's second attempt to get some recognition for this bill. He tried last year and it became tacked onto the Omnibus Anti-Poverty Bill. It fell by the wayside just before the Omnibus Bill passed.

We would not approve of jobs created just for the sake of making jobs. The Clark legislation calls for real jobs to satisfy real needs. It would provide funds to cities and towns to hire people for jobs that otherwise could not fit into the city budgets. For example, if a city hospital needed workers but there was no appropriated money left to hire them, this federal bill could come to the rescue.

It also encourages qualified private employers to receive funds from the government for hiring and training members of the hard core unemployment community.

The proposed legislation (which calls for a four year program) would cost about \$2,000,000,000 the first year. That's a lot of money in anybody's book, but we're already paying out money for the welfare of the unemployed. It costs the federal government about \$3,500 a year to care for one unemployed person on welfare. If that person is trained and given a job, he becomes a wage earner. When he becomes a wage earner, he also becomes a taxpayer. Now he would not only be off the welfare rolls, which saves us money, he would also be paying money into the government through taxes.

WCAU-TV sees the Emergency Employment and Training Act of 1968 as an excellent and desperately-needed investment.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION JURISDICTION SAVES MONEY FOR MASSACHUSETTS CONSUMERS

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, last year during hearings on S. 1365 I wrote Senator MAGNUSON, chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, to express my opposition to this legislation, which would amend the Federal Power Act so as to seriously limit the Federal Power Commission's jurisdiction over wholesale suppliers of electric power. My conviction of the correctness of my original view has been strengthened in the intervening period.

Last year, I pointed out that—

New England has the highest electric power rates in the United States, and Massachusetts has the highest rates in New England. The wholesale rates paid by members of the Municipal Electric Association of Massachusetts have frequent investigations by the Federal Power Commission and, in some instances, reductions have been ordered. Con-

tinuing and future action by the Commission will hopefully bring future reductions and corrections of inequities so that New England's rates will come more reasonably in line with the prevailing national average. But if the Federal Power Commission's authority to regulate wholesale rates and to adjudicate controversies between smaller systems and large wholesale suppliers of electric power is emasculated, and I do not see how a reasonable interpretation of the language of S. 1365 could lead to any other conclusion, then Massachusetts power suppliers and consumers will be worse off than before.

Earlier this month the municipal light boards of the towns of Reading and Wakefield in Massachusetts filed a complaint with the FPC which demonstrates the kind of problem with which the Commission is called upon to deal.

The complaint contends that the service of Boston Edison to Reading "does not meet public utility standards," and cites a number of outages on the Boston Edison system which have jeopardized Reading's ability to meet the needs of its consumers.

It points out that Boston Edison's rates of return "have been running at rising, excessive levels, from 6.88 percent in 1962, to 7.75 percent in 1966." The company's current wholesale rates to Reading and Wakefield average some 11.3 mills per kilowatt-hour, as compared to the 8.4-mill national average of investor-owned utility sales to municipal utilities in 1965, the complaint reports.

It also observes that the company's retail rates "are the highest in the country, for cities over 50,000 population, judging by the typical 250-kilowatt-hour monthly bill comparisons; and in practically every retail category, there is a long term upward trend when 1946 and 1966 typical bills are compared." The complaint finds that Boston Edison's overall revenues were excessive by some \$14,500,000 a year, based on 1965 cost data.

Reading and Wakefield ask the FPC to determine "why Edison's administrative and general costs run some approximately 2 mills per kilowatt-hour, about double the national average, which is below 1 mill kilowatt-hour." The complaint suggests that the towns are "subsidizing in rates the high costs of operating obsolete generating stations which prudent, aggressive management would have long ago replaced." It also charges that Boston Edison's approach to wholesale rates involves illegal restraints of trade.

It is exactly this kind of situation which the FPC is uniquely qualified to examine. Yet it is possible that Boston Edison might escape from Commission jurisdiction with passage of S. 1365.

Boston Edison was one of some 28 utility systems which experienced a major power failure in November 1965. An estimated 30 million Americans in an eight-State area were affected by the Northeast blackout. If that incident proved nothing else, it showed the interstate character of the electric industry of our region, including Boston Edison.

Actions by the FPC have resulted in the New England Power Co. reducing its wholesale rates by a total of \$3,200,000 in 1964 and 1965. In another case, FPC suspended a \$410,000 increase in trans-

mission charges by Narragansett Electric Co. to New England Power Co., and authorized an increase of only \$94,000. So FPC jurisdiction benefits the consumers of both privately and publicly owned electric consumers.

Protection of consumers against excessive charges for electricity is not a partisan issue. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the *Record* at this point a news story from the Philadelphia Bulletin reporting on a statement by Governor Shafer of Pennsylvania which urges that Republicans give attention to private power company overcharges and a statement issued last week by Betty Funness, President Johnson's Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs, opposing S. 1365.

There being no objection, the article and statement were ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Sunday Bulletin, Dec. 31, 1967]

SHAHER URGES REPUBLICANS TO TAKE LEAD IN PROTECTING CONSUMERS' RIGHTS

(By Duke Kaminski)

HARRISBURG.—Governor Shafer yesterday urged the National Republican Coordinating Committee to take a leadership position on consumer protection at all levels of government.

Shafer wrote the policy committee, which includes Republican governors, Congressmen and state chairmen, that too many voters are of the mistaken opinion that only the Democrats are concerned with their plight in at least a dozen fields of business where sharp practices exist.

Shafer, urging creation of a Task Force on Consumer Protection, commented:

"Notice the names in the news and you can readily see who are the advocates of consumer protection. They are Democrats. This is not to say that only Democrats call for protecting the American consumer."

DEMOCRATS GET CREDIT

"This is to say that Democrats are getting credit for it. Republicans are acting—quietly—but prices continue to climb, and the fraud goes on."

Shafer enclosed a 30-page brochure outlining alleged frauds in insurance, charitable solicitations, land sales, brand-name drugs, trading stamps, auto sales, dance schools, public utilities, credit financing, uninspected meats, hospital costs and home improvements.

The proposal is aimed at furthering Shafer's candidacy as cochairman of the platform committee of the 1968 Republican National Convention. Shafer's candidacy, advanced by fellow governors, has run into GOP congressional opposition.

The brochure, outlining charges of sharp practices, contains some salty language, which is likely to be challenged in some areas.

CITES DRUG PRICES

In the running controversy on the pricing of brand name and generic named drugs, Shafer declares:

"It costs the user up to five times as much to buy basic drugs under the brand name of leading firms as it does to buy them in the cheapest available form under the common generic name. There is no difference between the two except the price.

"Drug firms are aware of their quasi-monopolistic position and take every measure to exploit it fully. They spend 24 cents out of every dollar to promote their products to doctors. They spend \$750 million a year on promotion; an average of nearly \$5,000 for each of the fulltime practicing doctors in the United States."

As a result, Shafer said, too many doctors are prescribing the higher-priced brand-name drugs.

AUTO INSURANCE

"Are the automobile insurance companies giving the consumer the full services for the price they pay?" Shafer asks.

"Industry spokesmen claim that the underwriting loss for all companies in 1965 was \$301 million, and that about a third of all companies had losses in their overall operations.

"Yet, there is some evidence that an 'underwriting loss' is an artificial bookkeeping device developed by the industry to justify high rates and low taxes. The companies keep one series of accounts for ratemaking purposes and another series of accounts to test for solvency and liquidity of assets and investment analysis."

OTHER EFFECTS

Under the double bookkeeping, insurance companies in most states, including Pennsylvania, base their current rates on the ratio between claims and current premium payments, disregarding their earnings on their stock and bond portfolio accumulated in low payout years."

Shafer continued:

"Poor insurance practices affect the consumer in many other ways:

"—Prompt overpayment of relatively slight injuries and gross underpayment of a very serious injury, usually after a long delay.

"—Twice as much is often paid out in insurance premiums as is collected in insurance benefits."

HOSPITAL COSTS

These were some of his comments on hospital costs:

"In spite of the great rise both in health services and in health costs, there has been a barely perceptible increase in the life span of Americans since 1954. In terms of average remaining lifetimes after age ten, U.S. males rank 31st and U.S. females 12th in the world.

"The fact is that U.S. hospitals are in bad shape. Many provide care that can only be called shoddy, most are greatly overcrowded and practically all are extremely expensive. The consumer is forced to foot the bill for inefficient business practices conducted by hospitals."

THE CHARITY INDUSTRY

These are some of the governor's comments in other fields:

Charities—"With the aid of aggressive sales campaigns, the charity industry took in \$8 billion in 1960, making it the fourth largest industry in the United States.

"In order to increase the amount of contributions, many charities use public relations gimmicks. To conceal the rising cost of their campaign drives, many leading charities have adopted accounting practices which may cloak, from the unsuspecting contributor, the fact that vast slices of his charity donation is financing an advertising campaign, instead of helping the kid on the poster."

RETIREMENT PARADISES

Land sales—"The selling of 'retirement paradises' in sunny Florida or scenic Arizona for 10 percent down and \$10 a month brings in over \$700 million annually to this industry.

"All too often, the sun shines down upon a swamp, or the unfortunate buyer finds himself paying property taxes to maintain a scenic desert."

Trading stamps—"In 1960, there were between 250 and 500 stamp companies doing between \$600 million and \$800 million of business. Despite their fantastic popularity, it is estimated that only 5 percent of the public actually redeem their stamps for goods, yet everybody is required to pay an informal sales tax of 2 percent for the privilege of having these stamps dropped into one's grocery bag."

AUTO SALES

Automobile sales—"The purchase of a car is the second most important purchase that most buyers make. In order to complete this transaction unscathed, he must have the knowledge and stamina to cope with a high-pressure world of tricky financing, clever sales tactics and attempts at selling lemons for the price of cars.

"One widespread abuse in used-car sales is the 'as-is' provision, which commits the buyer to all the terms of the contract, regardless of the shape he finds the car in, once he signs the contract. Other favorite tricks include turning back the odometer; hiding, rather than repairing, defects, and the use of salesmen posing as private parties who 'must sell immediately.'"

THE DANCE RACKET

Dance schools—"A particularly vicious racket, one that cynically preys on the emotional insecurities of shy, lonely people is the dance racket.

"These schemes depend on building an emotional attachment between the instructor and the student, which is used to pry more and more funds out of the victim. Teachers are given 3 to 5 percent commission on all monies collected.

"The average cost of a lifetime membership is about \$12,000. In one case, a widowed New York woman, age 79, paid \$11,800. Once they have paid, the lifetime members suddenly find themselves unwelcome."

UTILITIES MONOPOLY

Utilities—"The individual utilities hold a virtual monopoly on a product whose demand doubles every ten years. Furthermore, they are assured profits plus costs, and they are not compelled to refund overcharges as is required of ordinary cost-plus operators.

"Strangely enough, these cost savings have been very slow in reaching the consumer. The total overcharge imposed on the public by 165 power companies in 1965 is claimed to amount to a staggering \$618 million."

Credit financing—"American consumers presently owe more than \$300 billion, and during the past ten years, the consumer credit outstanding has grown from 14.5 to 17.5 percent of the disposable personal income. Meanwhile, the personal bankruptcy rate has tripled in the past decade, numbering 170,000 last year.

"Some lending institutions and businesses have used a game of deceptive percentages to cloak the extent of interest charges. Some of the favorite techniques include the pitch in which no interest is quoted at all, and emphasis is placed on the low payments of \$10 a month or 'pennies a day.' This is the favorite approach of those who prey on the poor and uneducated.

THE ADD-ON SYSTEM

"A popular gimmick among the automobile dealers is the add-on system, in which the dealer 'picks in' all sorts of extras such as credit investigation, loan processing, late-payment service and the like.

"An added feature of the credit game, as played by many auto dealers, is the kickback. The finance company lends the dealer the money to buy his cars from the manufacturer, without interest naturally, and in return the dealer throws most of the installment contracts he makes to the finance company. Today, almost half of many dealers' profits comes from seeing that the customer pays the highest possible finance charges. The higher the rate, the larger the kickback."

FOUR D'S IN MEAT BUSINESS

Meat—"Nationally, 15 percent of the commercially slaughtered animals and 25 percent of the commercially processed meat are not covered by adequate inspection laws. There is virtually no effective control over pitiless greedy operators who traffic in the four D's—dead, dying, diseased or disabled animals—in order to cut a few cents off costs.

"In one year alone, 115 U.S. inspectors condemned 22 million pounds of meat that either was rancid, mouldy, odorless, unclean or contaminated. A government survey of poultry samples from two representative plants showed that 11.2 percent of the chickens contained salmonella organism."

"Between 10 to 30 percent of that ham that looks so meaty could be water pumped into it. That slab of beef that tasted so stringy but looked so nice was glamorized through the use of such cosmetics as water, gum, cereals and chemicals."

An attempt to improve Pennsylvania laws on meat inspection failed to clear the 1967 session.

STATEMENT FROM THE OFFICE OF THE SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT FOR CONSUMER AFFAIRS, MARCH 13, 1968

S. 1365 is contrary to the interests of electric consumers. Its enactment would represent a backward step in recent Congressional efforts to insure adequate regulatory protection for those who purchase goods and services for their own use. Your committee has exercised clear leadership in the drive to aid American families in their own attempts to guarantee that the dollars they spend buy safe, reliable, and reasonably priced products. I am confident that the committee will not wish to report favorably a bill which moves in the opposite direction.

Sale of electricity is an area in which adequate regulatory safeguards are essential. Electricity is the end product of a \$75 billion industry involving an interstate complex of generation and transmission. It is an essential ingredient of modern society, as testified to by such events as the Northeast blackout of 1965, and the 1967 power failure in Maryland, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. It is normally sold under monopoly conditions and the consumer cannot "shop around" for a more favorable price. Neither the housewife who turns on her electric mixer nor the man who plugs in his electric shaver has the time or technical talent to probe behind their electric bill. That is why we have regulation.

S. 1365 would create a loophole in the law which would permit utilities to escape FPC regulation at a time when the need for such public protection is increasing. On the other hand, S. 1934, the Electric Power Reliability Bill, also pending before your committee, would establish the machinery to deal with problems posed by the rapid expansion of the electric industry, which is doubling in size each decade. I urge that the committee take a look at the future, rather than attempt to restore the past, and support attempts to lower power costs. The stakes are enormous. A reduction of $\frac{1}{10}$ of a cent per kilowatt-hour would represent an annual savings of about \$2.7 billion in 1980.

NEW AND BETTER PROGRAMS MEAN FARM PROGRESS

MR. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in praise of the President's "Farm and Rural America" message. I think the President has shown great depth of understanding and compassion in defining the problems of the farmer and the nonfarm rural resident. His statement shows his sympathy and compassion for the poor and the boxed in families living in our countryside.

The President has shown very clearly that these citizens are in a situation not of their making, and not of their control. He has ably demonstrated in his message the great need for substantial and immediate relief. He has also shown that continuation and expansion of present programs must be immediately

implemented or the Nation will suffer irreparable damage.

To these aims and principles I add my wholehearted support.

I also want to say at this point that I believe the problems stated by the President and the solutions he has proposed should be considered regardless of party lines and no matter from what part of the country my colleagues may come. The problems we face must be dealt with realistically, wholeheartedly, and with a deep concern for the continuing progress of our Nation.

As the President stated, his proposals to place American commercial agriculture on a sounder and stronger footing constitute only half the battle we face in our rural areas. The other half of the problem is made up of combating the problems of our rural people who are ill-housed, unemployed, underemployed, undereducated, and lacking in full health facilities. It is appalling to me that in this time of abundance across our country, so many of our citizens lack the basic facilities of water and sewer systems.

In my own State of Oklahoma, Mr. President, Federal water and sewer loan and grant programs helped finance 78 such systems to the benefit of more than 12,000 rural people in 1967.

In fiscal year 1966, these basic facilities were provided for more than 40 Oklahoma communities.

But the problem is by no means solved, or even being touched in hundreds of other communities in Oklahoma and thousands of similar rural areas otherwise scattered throughout America. These programs constitute the best and most prudent way of giving these communities assistance at a minimum cost to the taxpayer. To me the relatively small amount of grant money necessary to carry out the program represents a wise investment in the future of rural America—an investment that will be repaid manifold in the economically developing years to come.

Mr. President, I was particularly delighted to note that the President urges the creation of a national food bank—a security reserve of wheat, feed grains, and soybeans—to protect the consumer against food scarcity and the producer against falling prices. I have introduced a bill to fill this need, and several of my colleagues in the Senate have done likewise. My bill provides for the establishment of reserves of wheat, feed grains, and soybeans by the purchase through the Commodity Credit Corporation of 200 million bushels of wheat, 15 million tons of feed grains, and 30 million bushels of soybeans. This reserve is to fill the need stated by the President to meet demands of emergency situations and is to be insulated from the marketplace for times of emergency.

In addition to the amounts held by the Department of Agriculture, my bill provides for an additional 200 million bushels of wheat, 15 million tons of feed grains, and 30 million bushels of soybeans to be held by the producer under the Department of Agriculture's extended resale program. In addition to the farm reserve held by the Commodity Credit Corporation, these additional

quantities are insulated from the market and held as a reserve and controlled by the producers.

I sincerely believe that the provisions of this measure fulfill the requirements laid down by the President for a national food bank. The bill fulfills the needs stated by the President when he said:

A National Food Bank can provide important protection for all Americans.

The farmer will not have to bear the burden of depressed prices when production exceeds needs.

The consumer will be protected from unanticipated food scarcity.

The Government will have a reserve stock "cushion" in making acreage allotment decisions and in responding to international emergencies.

My colleagues and I are hopeful that these measures urged by the President not only in the "farm and rural America" message, but also in his state of the Union address will receive early consideration and approval by Congress.

If we get this food bank bill through Congress this spring, we will be in a position to take immediate action for the crops which will develop this year, and I believe that this represents the spearhead of implementation of the President's policy.

My colleague from Oklahoma and I have also cosponsored the Rural Job Development Act to provide tax incentives for industry locating in rural areas, encouraging rural development. The President's message likewise gave support to this principle. His message clearly shows the depth of understanding and the multitude of complex problems surrounding this need, and I am quite happy to work with the President in this area, in the hope we can help halt the rural to urban shift.

Let me call to your attention the fact that less than a week after the President's message there was presented to the Congress the report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. This document, now commonly called the riot report, sets out the great need presently felt by our cities for aid. It shows very clearly situations which require a fantastic amount of Government help and direction.

Mr. President, I think we are all keenly aware of the tremendous needs of our cities. The burdens being borne by our urban areas in health, housing, highways, and employment opportunities are extensive and immediate.

But I want to call attention to the fact that in thousands of our nonurban communities there is likewise a pressing need for immediate help in these same areas. Our rural people are ill housed, unemployed, underemployed, undereducated, and lacking in full health facilities. A large number of these communities are in dire need of adequate running water and sanitary sewer facilities, and I think our larger cities do have those, at least.

Those Americans who choose to live in our rural areas have the right to have available to them the same kind of employment opportunities, the same criteria for home loans, the same standards for health facilities, the same opportunity for basic education, and the same hopes

for participation in the abundance of our country as the city citizens.

The American farmer has been caught in the same vortex of rising prices as everyone across the country has, but with the added difficulty of uncertainty of income, and in a great number of cases a depressed income.

If the present deplorable state of the rural economy is to continue, we will simply see the disappearance of the grassroots of America. And it necessarily follows that the urban problems will compound.

In Stillwater, Okla., on May 17-18 a meeting will be held to discuss the continuing migration to large cities by the rural population. This meeting will be cosponsored by the Ford Foundation, Oklahoma State University's Manpower Research and Training Center, and the Senate Subcommittee on Government Research. It will be chaired by Senator HARRIS, of Oklahoma.

This conference at Stillwater will hopefully come up with positive recommendations for the best use of our rural manpower. The great wealth of our country is in our people, and this means the rural people as well as the city people. America needs the full range of manpower, and we will not get that if we develop only the urban side, or remedy only the urban ghetto problems.

Mr. President, there is another major stumbling block to rural development which was thrust upon rural America arbitrarily last week. The Treasury summarily announced the death knell for interest-free municipal industrial development bonds.

These bonds have been a vital part of the life-force of nonurban industrial establishment, particularly in Oklahoma, where the new ruling would block the creation of 16,000 new jobs now for non-urban Oklahomans. As far as I am concerned, this action is contrary to the expressed intention of Congress, and totally without authority. I hope Congress will take action immediately to stop this kind of unauthorized, illegal rulemaking, which can only damage our endeavors to help the economy of rural America.

Mr. President, perhaps no single institution has contributed more to rural America than our system of rural electric cooperatives. I believe that no institution is better qualified and prepared for the drive to bring industries and all the amenities of modern life to the countryside.

REA systems are already playing a vital role in rural economic development. In addition to bringing electric power in at reasonable rates, they are leaders in the field of industrial development. In Oklahoma the co-ops have helped to launch at least 85 projects creating 2,900 jobs for rural people. Nationally, since the rural areas development program began in 1961, REA co-ops have helped to start 2,000 projects creating at least 182,000 jobs—in agriculture, forestry, recreation, community facilities, and industrial development. I believe we must continue this vital program, and even expand it not just as a temporary measure, but permanently until the full benefits of this vast project are reality.

I realize the country is in a squeeze for proper funding of all worthy projects, and that there is a hue and cry for cutbacks and reduced spending. To those proponents, I must say that their ideas are grand, but the truth is we cannot ignore those areas of continued progress which are actually investments. The water resources and conservation efforts must continue, must be adequately funded, or we simply are going to lose our most valuable resource, our land. We cannot now abandon the great work which has gone on before, and we need to keep this effort going to get maximum return on the money already spent.

Senator HARRIS has cosponsored a bill to give the owners of property, or going businesses, or farms and ranches an option at estate tax time, so that a fairer method of evaluating the going concern can be made. The hard fact is that now because of factors, again not of the farmer's doing or under his control, the valuation of his business is improperly inflated, resulting in hardship to his heirs and devisees. I support this legislation because I believe it will work toward a more honest and factual tax structure, and benefit the farmers and ranchers and their dependents who have been hardest hit by the current regulations.

I have also been active in the legislation for better meat inspection in an effort to upgrade the market for our cattlemen, and inspire confidence in the consumer. That legislation is now law. There was a time when the consumer was unsure of the product he bought until the meat inspection acts were made national in scope. Now, with the 1967 legislation, all America can be sure of the meat and meat products purchased, and the producer can be sure he is going to get a fair shake in the market when he sells his stock. Better grading and inspection are beneficial to all parties concerned, and I am hopeful the States will get their legislation in effect in the earliest possible time.

There is another area, Mr. President, which requires the immediate attention of Congress: we need work on the legislation to make the same home loans available to the rural resident that are now available to the city dweller. Double standards just will not be accepted anymore. Criteria for homebuilding loans from the Federal Government must stand on the same footing, and be given equal consideration in the use of Federal moneys. The farmer desiring to build his home has had to conform to someone else's standards for too many years, and he should have the right to build his house with Federal assistance without a sacrifice in space, quality, or time, as is now the case in too many instances.

Mr. President, I urge this Congress to implement with all possible haste the President's plan for bringing new prosperity to rural America. I ask this be done not at the expense of our cities, but in a manner which will allow all American citizens to participate fairly and properly in economic abundance; to allow the opportunities of housing, fair dealing, improved economies, and full education to our farmers and nonurban

citizens. I believe the President has stated it well when he said that this program will help the American farmer gain his place and privilege in the life of the Nation.

In this way, Mr. President, the full resources of the Federal Government can be applied with equity, integrity, and full fairness so all citizens can join in promoting our common progress. To do less is to stagnate.

BETTY FURNESS OPPOSES S. 1365

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, last week Betty Furness, the Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs, released a statement expressing her opposition to S. 1365, a bill which would weaken the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission over private power companies. She pointed out that now is a time to strengthen, not weaken, regulation, and noted that the stakes are enormous. She observed:

A reduction of $\frac{1}{10}$ of a cent per kilowatt-hour would represent annual savings of about \$2.7 billion in 1980.

While the FPC does not regulate retail rates, it is charged with the responsibility for reviewing wholesale sales in interstate commerce, financial operations and books of account, and the interconnection and coordination of public utilities. The Commission's activities in these fields have had a profound effect on all electric rates in recent years, a fact recognized by Betty Furness. I ask unanimous consent that the text of her statement and my own statement made to the Commerce Committee last year be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the office of the Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs]

S. 1365 is contrary to the interests of electric consumers. Its enactment would represent a backward step in recent Congressional efforts to insure adequate regulatory protection for those who purchase goods and services for their own use. Your committee has exercised clear leadership in the drive to aid American families in their own attempts to guarantee that the dollars they spend buy safe, reliable, and reasonably priced products. I am confident that the committee will not wish to report favorably a bill which moves in the opposite direction.

Sale of electricity is an area in which adequate regulatory safeguards are essential. Electricity is the end product of a \$75 billion industry involving an interstate complex of generation and transmission. It is an essential ingredient of modern society, as testified to by such events as the Northeast blackout of 1965, and the 1967 power failure in Maryland, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. It is normally sold under monopoly conditions and the consumer cannot "shop around" for a more favorable price. Neither the housewife who turns on her electric mixer nor the man who plugs in his electric shaver has the time or technical talent to probe behind their electric bill. That is why we have regulation.

S. 1365 would create a loophole in the law which would permit utilities to escape FPC regulation at a time when the need for such public protection is increasing. On the other hand, S. 1934, the Electric Power Reliability Bill, also pending before your committee, would establish the machinery to deal with problems posed by the rapid expansion of the

electric industry, which is doubling in size each decade. I urge that the committee take a look at the future, rather than attempt to restore the past, and support attempts to lower power costs. The stakes are enormous. A reduction of $\frac{1}{4}$ of a cent per kilowatt-hour would represent an annual saving of about \$2.7 billion in 1980.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR ERNEST GRUENING ON S. 1365, A BILL TO AMEND THE FEDERAL POWER ACT WITH RESPECT TO THE JURISDICTION OF THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION TO THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

For the record of the Senate Commerce Committee I express, with this statement, my strong opposition to the enactment of the Bill, S. 1365, now pending before it. As one who has long been deeply concerned with the protection of consumers of electric power against unscrupulous practices of public utilities I must protest this latest connivance of the utilities against the interests of the consuming public.

In the first place, the language of S. 1365 is impossibly ambiguous. It is very difficult to tell whether the intent and ultimate effect of enactment would be limited only to issues surrounding the specific case of Federal Power Commission jurisdiction over the Florida Power and Light Company or whether it would have much broader effect. The meaning of the word "temporary" in subsection (2) is undefined and, as has been pointed out by the Federal Power Commission this term could be found to apply to a variety of situations in which a public utility might receive or distribute power derived from an out of state source. Thus, we might find the exemption from regulation proposed by S. 1365 to be very broad, indeed.

Also, the construction of the sentence making up subsection (2) raises a basic question as to whether the exemption from regulation for "temporary or emergency purposes" would apply only to utilities having indirect connections with out of state supplies of energy or whether the exemption would also apply to those having direct connections.

From its sponsorship and chief expressions of support of the legislation, it would appear the purpose of the bill is that of obtaining private relief for the Florida Power and Light Company from what it regards as onerous regulation by the Federal Power Commission.

Nevertheless, the measure is framed in general terms and would, if enacted, be the law of the Nation. Therefore, all consumers of electric power, in whatever state residing, must be concerned about the potential mischief that could be done by this legislation. The ambiguity of the language and the lack of agreement on the purpose of the bill appear to make it impossible to estimate with any accuracy the number of public utilities and which public utilities would be affected by passage of the bill.

In any case, it could be expected that enactment of S. 1365 would certainly cause the utilities to do whatever might appear necessary to insure exemption from Federal Power Commission jurisdiction under its provisions. Although the number of utilities that might be exempted from Federal regulation by this legislation might be unclear no doubt exists now, or ever has, that the electric utility companies do not like regulation by the Federal agency empowered to control them and will do anything they can think of to escape it.

S. 1365 is, as was S. 218 of the 89th Congress, another invention in the long series of tireless efforts of the electric utilities to avoid meaningful regulation of their activities. The necessity for Federal regulation came about as a result of the excesses of the utilities and abuses of the public interest which I recounted in my book, "The Public Pays," published in 1931 and republished in 1965 as "The Public Pays—and Still Pays." An investigation by the Federal Trade Com-

mission, pursuant to a Senate resolution in 1928 revealed to the public the shocking manner in which the electric power companies, without any regulation, had made fortunes at the expense of helpless consumers, meanwhile conducting a ferocious campaign against the newly developing public power entities which was to be augmented later by a similarly ruthless attack on the Rural Electric Cooperatives.

It was after these abuses of the public welfare had been exposed that Congress passed the Public Utility Holding Company Act, including parts II and III of the Federal Power Act which S. 1365 would dangerously weaken. It is astonishing to find, as is the case, that, when my book was reissued in 1965 the attitude of the electric utilities toward their responsibility to the public had changed not at all and that these powerful instrumentalities were still endeavouring to crush the public power organizations and the Rural Electric Cooperatives. Throughout the years the private utilities have never given up for a day their position that Federal regulation is unnecessary and undesirable and that State regulatory action is sufficient. This has ever been the theme song and the constant refrain throughout the years. The support now given to S. 1365 is just another verse in the old familiar song.

We who would protect the interest of the consumer in the price paid for a necessity of life—electric power—can never abandon the fight for the highest standards of regulation of the producers of this commodity. An essential element in this is the maintenance of strong control by the Federal Power Commission over interstate sale of electricity. S. 1365 is a threat to the public interest in the protection of the public against excessive electricity costs and it must not be allowed to pass.

Besides the public interest in protecting the consumer against excessive costs, S. 1365 must be opposed because it would threaten another aspect of the public interest in the distribution of electricity. That is the growing concern that our technology and skills of organization be employed as fully as possible to extend and strengthen interconnections of power supplies throughout the nation so that our resources of power are utilized wisely and service is efficient and dependable. The legislation recently introduced by the Chairman of the Commerce Committee to encourage this very objective is indicative of the importance with which it is viewed by the agency and the technicians most closely acquainted with the facts. Nothing would retard and delay the progressive developments now close to achievement in this field so much as the kind of legislation proposed by S. 1365. Enactment of legislation to encourage the utilities to limit rather than increase interconnection of services would certainly deprive the nation of the benefits of technology the public should be allowed to enjoy.

If the purpose of S. 1365 is to limit exemptions from Federal Power Commission jurisdiction to the set of facts existing in the Florida Power and Light Company case it should be pointed out that this issue is now before the courts for determination. This being a matter now subject to decision by the Judicial Branch of the Government it is not properly a matter for legislative action.

If the purpose of S. 1365 is wider than this its potential for damage to the public interest is too great to allow its success.

I urge the Commerce Committee to reject S. 1365 and consign this misbegotten attempt at legislation to oblivion.

As for the part of S. 1365 which would exempt the Rural Electric cooperatives from FPC jurisdiction I have repeatedly expressed my opinion that such jurisdiction was never intended by the Federal Power Act, which preceded creation of the Rural Electrification Administration.

It is my hope this question has now been settled satisfactorily by the FPC decision on January 5, 1967 in the *Dairyland* case. This is another matter now before the courts for adjudication of a different aspect of the issue than that raised by the *Dairyland* proceeding. Should the result of the litigation be a reversal of the position now taken by the Federal Power Commission it may be necessary for Congress to act as the Senate did in the 89th Congress and pass legislation clarifying Congressional intent with respect to the exemption of the REAs from FPC jurisdiction. However, action on S. 1365 is not, in any way, the method which should be followed to accomplish this objective.

The tacking of the REA exemption provision on to S. 1365 must be regarded as a wholly cynical attempt by the public utilities to draw support for their efforts from the very organizations they have done nothing but try to put out of business throughout the history of this issue. The record of outrageous and constant propaganda campaigns against the Rural Electric Cooperatives is a shocking one and gives the lie to any suggestion this legislation is intended to be of benefit to them.

It is absurd to equate the eagerness of the private utilities to escape legitimate regulatory controls with the efforts of the rural electric cooperatives to establish the very fact they are in a completely different position from the utilities and should, for good reason, be recognized as having a different status insofar as Federal regulation of activities is concerned.

Let us hope this Committee disposes of S. 1365 by firm rejection.

EXPANDING GRAIN EXPORTS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to a letter, written by Mr. Michel Fribourg, head of the Continental Grain Co., of New York, one of the world's largest grain dealers, to the editor of the New York Times on January 23. In the letter, Mr. Fribourg points out the importance of expanding our grain exports as one major means to deal with our balance-of-payments problem positively, and the grave danger to our agricultural exports from the imposition of protectionist measures by the United States. He warns that if U.S. agriculture loses its dollar-grain markets abroad through retaliation by our customers, the entire U.S. economy will be adversely affected.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Fribourg's letter be printed in the RECORD. There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO EXPAND GRAIN EXPORTS

TO THE EDITOR:

One positive solution to the pressing United States balance of payments problem is to expand existing markets and vigorously pursue new ones to sell more American products abroad.

It is not widely recognized that grain exports have been the largest dollar earner for the United States. Secretary of the Treasury Henry Fowler recently said that if it were not for the earnings from exports of agricultural products, the United States would have long since faced a national economic crisis and the value of the dollar would have been seriously undermined.

Last year total United States agricultural exports reached almost \$7 billion, of which commercial sales for dollars earned \$5.2 billion. Grain and soybeans accounted for a substantial portion of these totals. Japan, our largest customer, purchased only slightly

less than \$1 billion worth of farm products last year.

EFFECT ON ECONOMY

In addition, the European Economic Community's trade in wheat, feedgrains and soybeans was valued at about \$800 million. This business is not only important to the American farmer, but reflects back through the entire United States economy.

I would caution our friends in steel, petroleum and other industries who have recently encouraged protectionist measures in Washington to remember that when a bushel of wheat, corn or soybeans is exported, steel and petroleum are also indirectly exported. These products are used by farmers to sow the seed and combine the grain. They are also used by the transportation industry to haul the product and so forth down to the water's edge for export and even across the ocean to the final destination.

If American agriculture loses its dollar-grain markets abroad through retaliation by our customers, the entire economy will be adversely affected.

In my opinion it would be a serious mistake for the United States to adopt protectionist measures—be they import quotas or barriers of another kind. Protectionism always triggers rapid retaliation. If such actions were taken, the United States would in all likelihood soon be involved in retaliatory trade wars with other nations.

Competition for world grain markets is aggressive and sharp. The United States is not the sole exporter of grain. We must not jeopardize our foreign outlets.

Narrow protectionist policies and economic nationalism are not only being threatened in our country, but elsewhere in the world, especially farm protectionism in the E.E.C. Protectionist interests in many countries have long petitioned their governments to restrict trade. The United States must not set the example to encourage these forces.

United States agriculture and the Agribusiness complex have a responsibility to support a liberal trade policy. It is imperative that the United States continue to exert strong leadership in the world to expand, not limit, trade.

MICHEL FRIBOURG.

New York, January 23, 1968.

The writer is an official of a grain company.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

SENATORIAL STANDARDS OF CONDUCT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 996, Senate Resolution 266, the unfinished business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which the clerk will state.

The BILL CLERK. Calendar No. 996, Senate Resolution 266, a resolution to provide standards of conduct for Members of the Senate and officers and employees of the Senate.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, under the order entered on yesterday I believe the Senator from Ohio is to be recognized.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the members of the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct are to be commended on their proposals for standards of conduct for Members of the Senate and employees and officers of the Senate. I agree with those proposals in every respect as far as they go, with the exception of that provision barring public disclosure of financial statements.

The committee recommended that the reports of financial income be filed confidentially with the Comptroller General to be opened only if the committee should so rule by majority vote at some future time. Unfortunately, from past experience it can be expected that no such report would come to public attention unless the committee were investigating a major scandal involving a U.S. Senator, such as was the situation in the last year or so. The fact is that reports held in confidential files are of little value in policing possible day-to-day conflicts of interest.

The members of the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct are six of the most eminent Senators of the United States. Each is highly respected for his integrity. Every Senator in the Chamber knows, without exception, that the six members of the committee were carefully selected. Their total years of service in the Senate is impressive. Each of the committee members has proved himself over the years to be a fine, dedicated public servant with a background of distinguished service to his State and to the Nation. All Senators have the highest admiration and regard for the members of the committee. Their recommendations will go far toward assuring proper standards of conduct of Senators, their employees and employees of the Senate. However, I am in agreement with the distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] that, in order to complete the outstanding work of the committee, the Senate should require that disclosure of financial interests be made available to the public.

In my considered judgment, honesty is easy to define. Thousands of years ago, the Almighty gave Moses the Ten Commandments, establishing for all time proper and adequate rules of conduct. It is unfortunate that thousands of years later it has become necessary for the Senate and the House of Representatives to create a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct and an Ethics Committee to define proper and improper conduct of their Members. More than 180 years have elapsed since those great patriots wrote the Constitution of the United States. For many, many decades no such special committees were created in either branch of the Congress. For many years no one even suggested doing so. It is regrettable that in recent years it has been deemed necessary to provide such committees.

As far back as 1951 a Senate subcommittee under the chairmanship of Senator Paul Douglas, one of the great Senators of all time, reported to the Senate:

Disclosure is like an antibiotic which can deal with ethical sicknesses in the field of public affairs. There were perhaps more gen-

eral agreement upon this principle of disclosing full information to the public and upon its general effectiveness than upon any other proposal. It is hardly a sanction and certainly not a penalty. It avoids difficult decisions as to what may be right or wrong. In that sense it is not even diagnostic; yet, there is confidence that it will be helpful in dealing with many questionable or improper practices. It would sharpen men's own judgments of right and wrong since they would be less likely to do wrong things if they knew these acts would be challenged.

Mr. President, that statement is as true today as it was then. The fact is that if Members of the Senate were to disclose publicly their income, assets, liabilities, and other pertinent information concerning their financial condition, it would enable the citizens of each State to decide whether or not a Senator's vote in any instance was determined by a desire for personal gain. The public could then call to account a Senator if it appeared that his financial situation, as disclosed, had resulted in a vote, an attitude of mind, or a position on the floor of the Senate or in committee inconsistent with his duty to his constituents and his responsibility to the Nation.

Mr. President, it so happens that I am the very first Member of either branch of Congress fully to disclose to the public his entire financial assets, holdings, and earnings. I did this first in 1959, and have repeated it every year since.

In 1957, I decided to become a candidate for U.S. Senator in the State of Ohio. The Republican incumbent was U.S. Senator John W. Bricker. He had never been defeated for public office in the State of Ohio. He had been attorney general of our State for a number of terms, and on three occasions was elected Governor of Ohio. In 1944, Senator Bricker had been the Republican nominee for Vice President of the United States. It was considered that he could not possibly be defeated for office in the State of Ohio.

However, late in 1957, I announced my candidacy for U.S. Senator and began to campaign throughout Ohio. Apparently, no one fancied that I had much of a chance. There was no thought even given to holding one of those \$100-a-plate appreciation banquets in order to raise a campaign fund for me. I am fearful that had a price tag of \$25 a plate been fixed, there would have been no attendance to justify holding such a banquet. I campaigned vigorously throughout the State and I won the Democratic nomination in the primary election of May 1958.

Following the Democratic primary in 1958, I came to Washington in high good spirits and called upon the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, at that time Mr. Paul Butler. I had hoped that perhaps now that I was the nominee of my party for U.S. Senator, there might be some financial assistance given me by the national committee.

Having made an appointment with Mr. Butler, I went to his office at the appointed time. I was kept waiting in the corridor for about an hour, but, finally, was admitted to his office. When I identified myself and stated my purpose, Mr. Butler looked me squarely in the eye, in a manner, I suspect, as an Alabama banker would look at a Negro sharecropper who was seeking a loan, shook

his head very definitely, and said, "No." He turned me down very coldly.

I left his office somewhat crestfallen. His parting words to me were—and, this was in 1958, "Mr. Young, you are too old to campaign for U.S. Senator. You should be thinking about retiring."

It makes me sad to have to say so, but it happens that Mr. Butler, who was much younger than I, unfortunately died in the early 1960's. Although I did not receive any aid at that time, I admired him as a good national chairman and regretted his passing. On the other hand, I am glad to be here as a U.S. Senator, serving my second term.

As I have said, it happens that I was the first Member of Congress in the history of this Republic to make a full and complete disclosure of his financial holdings and assets. I did that in a letter to the Secretary of the Senate, the Honorable Felton M. Johnston, early in 1959, and authorized him to make my letter public. Annually, since that time, I have repeated the process, making full and complete disclosure of all my financial holdings, income, and debts, if any.

On every occasion I have authorized the Secretary of the Senate to disclose my letter, so that the general public could examine it. It has annually been published in Ohio. Also, in years since, I have disclosed publicly a copy of my income tax return for the preceding year.

To come back to the reason that motivated me in doing so, I will try to be brief in explaining it. Let it be understood, Mr. President, that following the time I made that complete disclosure in 1959 which I have repeated each year thereafter, I have never acted as a crusader on this subject nor regarded myself as a crusader. It has always appeared to me that this was a matter of conscience on my part. It was a matter of doing what I said I would do, and that was that.

In 1954 the great St. Lawrence Seaway project had been voted on in both branches of the Congress of the United States. We in the Middle West, Mr. President, as you know full well, are proud of the great St. Lawrence Seaway. We knew that that seaway would do a great deal for the Middle West and for America, and give us another seacoast, you might say.

Every Republican Member of the House of Representatives from Ohio, and every Democratic Member of the House of Representatives from Ohio voted in support of the St. Lawrence Seaway. In the Senate of the United States, Senator Taft, of Ohio, voted for it and spoke in favor of it. Of the entire Ohio delegation, only my opponent, Senator John W. Bricker, who was termed "Honest John," was against it.

By the way, when former President Truman came into Ohio in 1958, he campaigned for my election to the Senate. In large part, I owe my election in 1958 to President Truman. I remember on one occasion he said, "When you find a politician referring to himself as 'Honest John,' run home quick and lock the henhouse door." That was helpful to me.

In the campaign, I learned that my opponent had organized a law firm on

the day he became a Senator of the United States, and that his law firm represented the Pennsylvania Railroad and other great railroad corporations of the country. Of course, the presidents of those corporations were unalterably opposed to the creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway. My opponent voted against the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Throughout Ohio, night after night, in meeting after meeting, I denounced my opponent for his vote against the St. Lawrence Seaway at a time when all Republican Members and all Democratic Members of Congress from Ohio and also his colleague, Senator Taft, spoke out in favor of it. He voted his selfish personal interest as his law firm represented the Pennsylvania Railroad, the New York Central and other railroad corporations, and I charged that this was a classic case of conflict of interests.

I denounced that vote in every place I spoke in the State of Ohio during the course of my campaign. In doing so, I made one promise to the people of Ohio. I said repeatedly, "Please elect me as your public servant in the U.S. Senate. If I am your U.S. Senator, I promise you that I will give up my private practice of law. Over the years I have been chief prosecuting attorney of Cuyahoga County, and following that, I have enjoyed a lucrative trial practice for many years. I have an established law firm. But if I am elected Senator, I will close my law firm because I do not want any thought, any whisper, of a conflict of interest."

On December 15, 1958, I closed my law firm.

A reporter from the Cleveland Press came over and wanted to take a picture of me scratching my name off the law firm door. I said, "No, I am not a Calvin Coolidge. I am not wearing any Indian bonnet. As a matter of fact, I do not want any publicity. I have arranged for the building to take my name off."

The truth is that when they took it off, I felt rather sad; but I had made that commitment, and I had also made the commitment in the course of the campaign that I would fully disclose my assets. In fact, as I happened to be appointed to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and that committee had sugar legislation before it, I sold a number of shares in South Puerto Rico Sugar Co., and took a financial loss.

Looking back on it, I know that was an unnecessary loss, and I should not have done it, because if a Senator fully and publicly discloses his financial holdings, then the citizens he is representing in Washington are able to see for themselves and determine for themselves whether or not any of his votes are actuated by selfish motives.

I have filed a complete statement of my financial holdings and condition during the past year, and every year since 1959. That is a practice I said I would follow, and I have done it, and I intend to continue to do it.

In my letter of this January to the Secretary of the Senate, I fully disclosed my income during the entire year 1967 and the sources of my income in addition to my salary, and then I stated

to him that as soon as my income tax for the year 1967 was completed—and it is in process of being completed—I would then make it public and send him a copy of it.

The proposal before us does not require that. The resolution offered here should have the support of the Senate. However, it is time that we ourselves recognize that public disclosure is by far the most practical and least painful way of maintaining the confidence of Americans in the integrity of their Government.

I am hopeful that the committee recommendations will be amended in the Senate to assure that such disclosures will be available to the public. I feel personally that Americans have the right to full knowledge of the economic interests and financial activities of those who represent them in the Senate of the United States.

By the way, Mr. President, I stated that had I held an appreciation banquet in 1958, I am sure it would have been very poorly attended. However, on September 14, 1963, an appreciation dinner was held for me in Cleveland. Frankly, I had a hand in organizing that dinner, and it was handled by political friends who had supported me in 1958 and who had hoped that I would run for reelection in 1964.

At the appreciation dinner nothing was said about campaign purposes. Although I paid out from my own funds more than \$45,000 for my campaign in 1958, there was no suggestion of reimbursement for that. The invitation merely said:

Senator Stephen M. Young Appreciation Dinner, September 14, 1963, Grand Ballroom, Sheraton-Cleveland Hotel.

There are 100 stars on that invitation. My committee, for some reason or other, put a white star in the center. I suppose, perhaps, I am assumed to be represented by that white star, among the other 99 stars.

Mr. President, I am glad to say that my personal friend, former President Harry S. Truman, very generously came to Cleveland from his home in Independence, Mo., and was the featured speaker at that banquet. I remember that President Truman was asked at a press conference preceding the dinner "Does Senator Young expect to be a candidate for U.S. Senator next year?" He replied, "Well, I would not have come here from Missouri unless I had believed that Senator Young would be a candidate for reelection next year."

The dinner was a success from a financial standpoint. Net proceeds of \$78,000 were derived from that dinner meeting. It was difficult to find in Cleveland the president of a bank who was also a Democrat, but we found one. George Herzog, then chairman of the board of the Union Commerce Bank, became treasurer of this fund. The entire net proceeds of \$78,000 were deposited in the Union Commerce Bank. It was stipulated that every check for a payment out of that fund must be signed by three persons—by George Herzog, the treasurer, and by two other prominent Democrats in Ohio.

That \$78,000 was entirely used in my campaign of 1964.

It seemed to me then, Mr. President, and it seems to me now, that this is the logical and proper way to conduct a fundraising affair for a political candidate. I knew that I had no right whatever to appropriate any of that money for my own uses and purposes. I feel that any man or woman who is elected to the Congress of the United States must certainly know the difference between right and wrong.

Mr. President, I believe we have made progress in the Senate in coming forward with this report and with the resolution that we are now considering. The committee's requirement of these two financial reports from Senators, however, can scarcely be called a real disclosure policy, as only one of the reports would publicly show campaign contributions, honorariums, and gifts, and then only those of more than \$300. There would be no public disclosure of the other financial statement.

A few minutes ago, I referred to former Senator Paul Douglas, one of the great Senators in the history of our country. He established a rule that he would not accept gifts of a value in excess of \$2.50. Frankly, I have made a rule, which I have lived up to, fixing a valuation of \$5—not \$2.50—as the maximum value of any gift that I will accept.

In that connection, I have said, somewhat facetiously but truthfully, that since it happens I rather like the taste of Canadian liquor, or the taste of bourbon, that I have fixed and established that every gift of a bottle of bourbon or Canadian liquor has a value of \$4.99, and is acceptable to me as a gift; and I have proceeded on that theory.

I do not necessarily advise that practice for others; but I praise the resolution and the report of the Committee on Standards and Conduct in its effort to establish rules to guide and be helpful to Senators.

I feel that this resolution deserves the support of all Senators regardless of party. I hope that this matter can be debated further and that any amendments that are offered will be seriously considered and debated.

Although I do not regard myself as any crusader on this subject, I know that it made me feel better when I did what I thought was right. I am not going to be critical of any of my colleagues who are members of law firms in their home cities. I have confidence that every one of them is serving unselfishly in Congress.

I will take any 100 Members of either branch of the Congress and put those 100 Congressmen alongside 100 directors of the greatest corporations of the United States, and for integrity and honor I will go along with the Congressmen.

I have that confidence in my colleagues. I am glad that we are going to have a full and complete debate on the measure.

Recently I received some information that a new book entitled "The Case Against Congress" by Drew Pearson and Jack Anderson was about to be published

and advertised by the publishing firm. I should have written the publishers that the members of the Senate Select Committee on Standards and Conduct are entitled to congratulations for scooping the authors of that new book. It seems evident the Senate committee moved with somewhat more than deliberate speed, to use a phrase from a decision of the U.S. Supreme Court, and we are now debating their report and the resolution they submitted before that book is on sale. They beat these nationally known columnists and their publishers to the punch, as the expression is. The present resolution certainly deals with problems that have been very much on the minds of Senators and Representatives in Congress during the past 2 years.

I again praise our distinguished colleagues who serve on this select committee. I intend probably to vote for some amendments and, after the matter has been fully debated, I intend to vote in support of the resolution.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR JACKSON AT THE JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY DINNER AT RALEIGH, N.C.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on March 9, 1968, the distinguished junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] delivered the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner address to approximately 2,000 North Carolina Democrats in meeting assembled at Raleigh, N.C.

The junior Senator from Washington made a most eloquent address to the North Carolina Democrats on that occasion. His address merits wide dissemination. For that reason, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR HENRY M. JACKSON TO THE JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY DINNER, RALEIGH, N.C., MARCH 9, 1968

I am pleased to be here in North Carolina to pay my respects to your great State, to your great Democratic Party and State Administration—and to my Democratic colleagues from North Carolina in the Congress of the United States. No delegation commands greater respect in the halls of Congress.

You know, there are so many Tarheels in the State of Washington, and so many of you have family members in my State that I feel I can accomplish a little personal "politicizing" down here. In fact, I'm not sure some of you don't vote in both places. Remember me in 1970, will you?

Your dinner chairman, Mr. Smith, tells me that Seattle was his father's home, and he still has family connections there. I know your good Congressman Roy Taylor was born in Vader, Washington. We all know Vader—it's just off the main road from Castle Rock to Winlock, and not far from Dryad, Doty

and Pluvius. Now how did a city boy like you ever settle down in Black Mountain, Roy?

Your United States Senators are men of great influence. They are also admired and held in great esteem and affection by their fellow Senators.

Sam Ervin is recognized in the Senate as a great lawyer and as an expert on the Constitution of the United States. Indeed, he has been a leader in the Senate in upholding and defending the Constitution, just as he has defended and served our country through many years of public service in war and peace. He earned the nation's second and third highest awards for valor in combat and he has earned the right to many more honors for his public service since.

As a ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, he has been a guardian of constitutional rights. He has authored and secured approval in the Senate of bills to secure the constitutional rights of Federal employees, and the rights of the mentally ill. He co-sponsored Federal Acts for the enforcement of criminal laws and the rehabilitation of narcotics addicts. He is the author of the Ball Reform Act. I was proud to support the Ervin amendment to authorize suits in Federal court testing the constitutionality of aid to private schools.

Sam Ervin has been a fighter for North Carolina in the United States Senate—for your textile industry, for your agricultural interests.

I am privileged to share many moments with him in the Senate. We serve together on two important committees—Armed Services and Government Operations.

Sixteen Senators are Chairmen of standing committees of the Senate. Everett Jordan is one of them. But he is in a special position as Chairman of the Rules Committee. The rest of us go to him for approval of resolutions authorizing activities by our Committees—so you can see that Everett Jordan has a special place in our hearts. He has always been very fair to me, and I am grateful to him. Everett Jordan is also in a key position on two other Committees whose work is of great importance to our country and to North Carolina—the Agriculture and Forestry Committee and the Public Works Committee.

You have a great team working for you in the House of Representatives.

L. H. Fountain, the dean of your delegation—I have the honor to work with him on many occasions when we have Conference meetings of the House and Senate Government Operations Committees.

Alton Lennon—with whom I served for two years in the Senate before he went to the "other body."

Basil Whitener—your respected representative on the House Judiciary Committee.

Roy Taylor of Vader, Washington—Roy is Chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation. I want you to know how grateful I am for all I hope he is going to do for me on a couple of my bills pending before his Subcommittee.

David Henderson—he was a staff member of the Education and Labor Committee in 1951 and 1952, the last two years I served in the House of Representatives. Now he serves you well as a distinguished Congressman.

Horace Kornegay will be missed in the Congress. Permit me to wish him well in his new endeavors.

Walter Jones and Nick Galifianakis are your newest Representatives—and have already made their mark.

How proud you can be of all these men.

Permit me to express thanks from Mrs. Jackson and myself for the gracious hospitality extended to us today by Governor and Mrs. Dan Moore. It has been a wonderful day in this beautiful city.

I will speak first about a burden we all bear, a problem with no end in sight, a situation we can expect will get worse before

it gets better—and that is the quality of television programs.

This is a crisis which challenges our political leadership. I propose that some of our leading politicians personally step into the breach and attack the entertainment gap. So many actors have been taking the place of politicians lately, it seems only fair that politicians have a chance to take the place of actors. Perhaps it could develop into permanent exchange program, although we must keep in mind the old axiom that while all politicians make good comedians, not all comedians make good politicians.

Here is my proposed TV Guide:

First, I think Mayor Lindsay and Governor Rockefeller are best experienced to take over for the "Smother Brothers." They could also do an outstanding job on "Rat Patrol."

For "Lost in Space" the obvious choice is George Romney—although he will also be in great demand for "Get Smart."

I may be accused of type-casting, but I am convinced that Richard Nixon is the man for "Mission: Impossible"—or maybe for "Flipper."

Two old favorites show up on my schedule: Harold Stassen in "Run for Your Life"—and Barry Goldwater in "Cowboy in Africa."

Everett Dirksen and Jerry Ford are slated to replace "The Monkees"—on condition that Senator Dirksen will also consent to fill in for "Captain Kangaroo."

Finally, the entire Republican National Convention will be featured on "Voyage to the Bottom of the Sea."

I must explain that I have been unable to line up any Democrats for individual starring roles. We are all booked solid for "Wild Kingdom."

Oh, I almost forgot—in a rather unusual switch, "Death Valley Days" is going to be the summer replacement for the Governor of California.

So much for the "entertainment gap." Now let me suggest we work on eliminating the "memory gap."

We Democrats have gotten so used to accomplishing things that we allow people to forget what has been done.

Well, let's just stop a minute and remedy that. Let's enjoy the pride and personal satisfaction of recalling just a little of what we Democrats have accomplished—just lately.

We want the best education for every American child. So we passed historic education legislation. The Federal Government has invested twice as much on education since 1963 as in the whole previous century.

Last year 9 million children in our country were helped in securing a better education because of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Aren't the Republicans interested in education? Sure they are, but three-quarters of the Republicans in the House of Representatives voted against aid to elementary and secondary education. We Democrats passed it.

We also sponsored and passed aid to higher education. A million and a quarter low-income students are in college today because of our Democratic grant and loan programs.

We want to protect the health of our people and assure proper medical care for older citizens. After a 20-year struggle we passed Medicare. Today, decent medical care is the right of almost 20 million older Americans. Seven and a half million senior Americans received care under the program last year. Well, aren't the Republicans interested in the health of senior Americans? Sure. But 93 per cent of them voted against Medicare in the House of Representatives.

We Democrats are serious about improving the health opportunities of all Americans. The national investment in health is now three times what it was in 1964.

We are also serious about maintaining prosperity. We have now seen 83 months of unbroken economic expansion. Unemployment is at its lowest point in 15 years. The national income grew three times as fast

between 1961 and 1967 as it grew in the preceding five years. Real personal incomes grew more during any one of those years than in the five years from 1956 to 1961 put together.

And taxes are down. Don't let anyone forget that we Democrats were responsible for the biggest tax cut in history. Even if we have to pass the temporary tax increase President Johnson has requested to meet our commitments at home and abroad and keep our economy in balance, Federal taxes will still be lower than what they would have been at the 1961 rates—the rates the last Republican Administration left us.

We have a lot more to do in America. We're not resting—not we Democrats. In 1967 our Gross National Product grew about \$43 billion. In 1968 it will grow over \$50 billion. We know we can afford to do what has to be done.

We also know there is a lot we can't afford in our country. We can't afford poor schools—we can't afford neglected children—we can't afford inadequate housing for our families—we can't afford opportunity denial.

Today, too many Americans haven't made it. They and their families are stuck with the short end of our country's great prosperity. The people who collect statistics tell us that 34 million Americans exist on less than the minimum needed for an adequate standard of living. These people are down—and they must get out.

Some of these people are black, some are white, some are Indian, some Puerto Rican—it's not just a Negro problem or a white problem, although it's often described that way. The problem is that a lot of people—for one reason or another—don't get an even break from the moment they come into this world.

Well, we're changing that. Our goal is that every child will have a real chance to make the best use he can of his God-given talents. Whatever it takes to do it, we are going to make that true in America.

Nationally, we have already accomplished much. In the last four years some 6 million Americans have beaten the statistics—they have risen above that poverty level. Since 1960, the number of Negro families earning more than \$7,000 a year has more than doubled.

Here in North Carolina you have accomplished a great deal. Quietly, unobtrusively, and with much good will on all sides, you have made strides in providing equal opportunities for all.

But when we make progress, some people get very upset. They say: "You're stirring up trouble. These people will never be satisfied. Once they get a little something they want more."

Well, that's true. Isn't it true of us all? Sure, when we raise people's hopes, we run the risk of dissatisfaction. People with hope are no longer satisfied to endure in silence the lot of the hopeless.

But isn't that what we Democrats have always done? Raised the hopes of people and made those dreams come true.

That is still our mission, and when it isn't the Democratic Party will have ceased to exist.

When that happens, people will be content with the Republican Party—for they have promised nothing, and they have always delivered on that promise.

Despite the foot-draggers and the doom-criers we Democrats are attacking the problems America faces—slums—rural poverty—crime—the destruction of our healthy environment—decay in our cities—discrimination—inequity for the American farmer.

President Johnson has challenged the Congress to act now to meet some critical needs:

A manpower program, enlisting private enterprise to wipe out hard-core unemployment;

A housing program that will mean a six-fold increase in low and middle income housing over the next decade;

A child health program;

Protection for the American consumer; Drug control, to "stop the sale of slavery to the young";

A farm program to help farmers bargain more effectively for a fair share of American prosperity.

If we fail to accomplish this for America in this Congress, it won't be because of the state of the economy, it won't be because we can't afford it, it won't be because of Vietnam—it will be because in 1966 we lost 47 seats in the House of Representatives to the people who promised nothing and deliver the same.

Let's remedy that in 1968. Don't let our country slip back. Give us more Democrats in Congress. Re-elect the Johnson-Humphrey Administration. Keep building a better America.

And make no mistake about it. We won't be able to keep building a better America here at home if we duck our responsibilities abroad.

We know that our fate is bound up with the fate of other free peoples. Time and again we have taken our stand beside those who have been threatened with subjugation.

America stands for a world in which freedom is perpetuated. We have fought two World Wars on that account. This was the essential basis of the Marshall Plan and NATO. It was the essential basis of the Korean War. It was the essential basis of the SEATO Treaty. It is the essential basis of the stand we and our fighting men are making in Vietnam.

The defense of free peoples against aggression has been a keystone of our foreign policy under four Presidents of both parties since World War II. That policy has caused us to take on great responsibilities and bear great burdens. Right now we are being tested as never before.

Our country is prosperous and powerful. But there are those in Hanoi who are betting that our very affluence weakens our resolve. They are counting on our free debate to magnify doubts and uncertainties—to cause our commitment to crumble.

Vietnam may be only one testing ground in a restless and dangerous world where a fresh crisis arrives as regularly as the morning paper and the evening news. How we as a people conduct ourselves under the strain of such pressures will be decisive. On this depends our survival in freedom and our chance to leave to our children a better America in a better world.

And we are showing the signs of strain. Some Americans are engaged in constructive criticism and debate of our policies. But some people are engaged in nothing less than the slander of America.

If anyone has a constructive suggestion to make on Vietnam policy, he should put it forward, so that it can be looked at hard and thoughtfully in an effort to understand its consequences—its pitfalls as well as its possibilities. But one shouldn't kid oneself or others, by passing off breast-beating and hand-wringing as a contribution to policy-making. Nervous prostration is not a policy. Nor are bald-faced political appeals unsubstantiated by the remotest hint of a plan—like "I will end the war."

I do not think our country is suffering from any "arrogance of power." We do have to endure the "power of arrogance" exercised by some of the critics.

One of the disturbing features of the discussion of American policy in Vietnam is that so many of those who fret about it cannot see beyond Vietnam itself. The importance of our effort in Vietnam can be understood only in the perspective of our foreign policy as a whole.

In Europe, we and our allies have succeeded in creating a reliable balance of forces. The independence and freedoms of Western Europe rest on this balance. In Asia, we and our friends and allies there are seeking, with far greater prospects of success than is recog-

nized by those who cannot see beyond Vietnam, to create a reliable equilibrium of forces. If we succeed, the benefits will accrue not only to all the non-communist countries of Asia but also to ourselves and to our European allies.

The importance of Vietnam must be judged in the context of Asia as a whole, and of the threatening and competing aspirations of the Soviet Union and Red China.

Is there any doubt that an American withdrawal from Vietnam or a humiliating compromise would open the doors to a vast extension of Chinese and/or Soviet influence in Asia? In that event, is it realistic to think that American commitments in Asia would decline? I do not believe so. On the contrary, I believe we would be called upon to extend our commitments on an even greater scale to many other areas, from Thailand to the Indian Ocean and to the Philippines.

It is false and misleading to assert that our country must choose between our important international responsibilities and our domestic ones, between the search for a stable and meaningful order in Asia and the search for justice and urban improvement at home. Obviously, the resources and capabilities of this nation are limited. We must use our power in accordance with a responsible ordering of our national interests. But this doesn't mean that in order to deal constructively with urgent domestic problems, we have to revert to the isolationist views which encouraged the outbreak of World War I and World War II.

In closing, let me say this: Our debates and discussions here at home have been mainly over how the war should be fought and how to move the conflict from the battlefield to meaningful negotiations. Sometimes obscured in the arguments over this or that tactic is the fact that no substantial or respected body of American opinion advocates retreat from Vietnam or an abandonment of Asia.

The North Vietnamese—and the Chinese and Russians too—should not be misled by our free debate. We will keep disputing over the means, but the overwhelming majority of the American people are determined that the end of the conflict—although it may not be easy or early—will be an honorable one.

EMPLOYEE PRIVACY, SICK LEAVE INVESTIGATIONS, AND S. 1035

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, commonsense is today the most vital and often the most rare ingredient in the operation of our Federal Government. This is particularly true in Government's relationship with those 3 million citizens who work for it. Commonsense should tell administrators that the entire Federal service will suffer when they allow actions which erode the dignity of civil servants, which invade their privacy, or which result in unfair decisions affecting their employment opportunities.

Extensive privacy-invasive investigation of employees who use their sick leave is an area which is sadly in need of commonsense.

Certainly, if an employee tells his supervisor he is sick, if he produces a certificate from a qualified medical doctor that he has been ill, that should be enough. Yet it is not enough in some agencies. Investigators may go to a sick employee's dwelling to see if he is really sick. In one case reported to the subcommittee recently, they acquired a key from the apartment-house manager and were entering the employee's apartment as he arose from his sickbed to greet them.

In other cases, agency inspectors called the employee's doctor to verify his story;

in some agencies, it is the practice to compel him to sign a form surrendering the confidentiality of his medical records and giving inspectors a fishing permit to examine his medical records and discuss the details of his case with his doctors.

Here, for instance, is a form used by the Agriculture Department:

To whom It May Concern:

I, ———, an employee of the United States Department of Agriculture, hereby authorize the bearer, a Special Agent of the Office of the Inspector General, United States Department of Agriculture, to examine and obtain copies of any and all medical records pertaining to my medical history for the period(s) ———, to include but not be limited to records of physical examinations, clinical diagnoses and prognoses, and medical and surgical treatment received by me.

This letter further authorizes any medical doctor, or any other person, in possession of any of my medical records to make such records and information available to and discuss my medical history with any Special Agent of the Office of the Inspector General, United States Department of Agriculture, for the period(s) specified above.

This authorization is given freely and voluntarily by me, knowing that the information obtained may be used in evidence.

Signed _____
(Employee's Name.)

In connection with the subcommittee's study of privacy in personnel investigations, the Civil Service Commission has supplied a policy statement on sick leave investigations. According to this report, the Commission places no controls on these investigations, but it believes that "only in a very small minority of cases is there justification for alleging abuse."

Mr. Macy states:

The Commission's regulations do not place any limits on the investigation an agency may make to establish that an employee was actually incapacitated during a period for which he has applied for sick leave, and they contain no provision requiring that an agency accept doctors' certificates as establishing that fact without question. The reason is that only the employing agency is close enough to the immediate situation to be in a position to control abuses. We believe that in only a very small minority of cases is there justification for alleging abuse, but do not believe that the Commission should tie the hands of the agencies when they have reason to believe investigation is necessary.

It is certainly not customary—

Mr. Macy tells us—

to question medical certificates although there have been a few instances in which agencies have done so.

It is clear that the Department of Agriculture has exceeded the bounds of commonsense in some of its recent investigations of sick leave of seasonal employees. Even when an employee has produced a valid certificate of illness from a qualified doctor, or when he has undergone an operation in a hospital, they feel it necessary to investigate the truthfulness of his claim. Such suspicion of its employees ill becomes an institution of the majesty and size of the Federal Government. Certainly, it cannot enhance its image in the communities where these practices occur.

One agriculture employee writes:

There is one other thing that I wish to call to your attention. According to a diagnosis made by two qualified medical doctors, I have

been suffering with a channel ulcer for more than a year. During January and February this condition caused me much distress and pain. One week after I returned home, I was advised by my doctor to begin taking sick leave and to go on a bland diet to try to overcome this condition. Also he wants me to have another x-ray made and to be examined by a doctor at Memorial Hospital in Chapel Hill, North Carolina. This is to determine whether or not it is desirable to remove this ulcer by surgery.

Therefore, I began using sick leave on March 4. The following morning, March 5, the investigator for the Inspector General's office, called on me at my home. He wanted me to sign a paper, which I gladly did, giving my doctor permission to divulge to him any and all information pertaining to my illness. Also, he wanted to see the bottles of medicine that I am taking. He also called on two of my neighbors and asked them questions about my physical condition and also about my personal financial circumstances. As neither of these neighbors is a doctor or banker, I don't believe they could give him much information. But this could cause me considerable embarrassment and create a lot of small town gossip.

I do not believe that this kind of harassment will do me much good in my efforts to overcome the effects of this ulcer.

I do not believe that the Tobacco Inspection Service can long continue to render a quality service to the tobacco growers when the men are forced to work and live under such deplorable and degrading conditions.

I wanted to bring these matters to your attention because I believe they are right in line with what you have been working on. I am sure that all Civil Service employees appreciate your efforts in their behalf.

When one of these cases from the Agriculture Department was called to his attention, the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission not only told the Agriculture Department that they should abolish the form, but also, he rendered an opinion which should be a commonsense guideline for all Federal administrators on this matter. He comments:

As the facts given in this case do not indicate any reason for the kind of investigation described, the Commission's staff checked informally with the personnel office of the Department here for whatever information might be available. It was found that the investigation of Mr. ———'s leave was part of a general investigation the Department made of sick leave used by seasonal employees which continued their pay status into what would have been a part of their unpaid furlough.

When an employee becomes incapacitated before a furlough, the employing agency may, although it is not required to, continue the employee in pay status for the period of incapacity if he has sufficient unused sick leave. The Department of Agriculture follows the policy of so continuing the pay status of incapacitated employees. Apparently the general investigation in question was initiated because the Department found an unusually high proportion of seasonal employees were applying for sick leave covering a period of furlough. Mr. ——— was included in the investigation because of the dates of his sick leave.

Although I would not question the Department's right to make a general investigation under the circumstances, I consider the authorization form it used to be inappropriate, and have written to the Secretary of Agriculture recommending that its use be stopped. I see no need, even in cases in which an agency feels it necessary to verify an alleged illness, for an investigator to examine and obtain copies of all medical records and to discuss the employee's medical history with his physician. In the rare instances in

which an agency might be justified in asking for the kind of medical details referred to in the authorization form, those details should be received only by a medical officer.

This policy statement should become the order of the day in the Federal Government. It will encourage administrative respect for the privacy of the individual, and further the goals of Government as an employer.

The fact that such practices exist, however, and that it requires congressional intervention to cut through the morass of redtape in such cases, illustrates the need for early passage of S. 1035, to protect the constitutional rights of Federal employees and prohibit unwarranted Government invasions of their privacy.

This truth was recognized by the Federal Tobacco Inspectors Mutual Association at their annual meeting held in Raleigh, N.C., on Saturday, March 9. They approved a resolution stating:

Be it resolved that the Federal Tobacco Inspectors Mutual Association endorses the provisions of Senate Bill 1035, to protect the privacy of employees of the Executive branch of the Federal government, and petitions the United States House of Representatives Post Office and Civil Service Manpower Resources Subcommittee to expedite consideration of this legislation vital to our nation's democratic processes and constitutional protections.

THE LABOR BOARD PLAYS THE OLD SHELL GAME

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, recently the National Labor Relations Board illustrated one of the many reasons Congress should be more active in its oversight of administrative agencies. Over the course of years since its creation, the Labor Board, like its sister agencies in other fields, has operated with little control by Congress and only intermittent supervision by the courts. Being largely free to interpret the laws according to its own special insight, the NLRB has developed a series of doctrines which one may call, speaking very generously, exceedingly peculiar.

One of the most peculiar is the confused and contradictory set of rules which prefer the use of authorization cards over secret elections to show that a majority of employees wish a particular union to represent them. I will not go into the many vagaries of this doctrine, now. The Subcommittee on Separation of Powers will consider that at great length in its hearing later this month on the Labor Board. But I wish to include in the RECORD an editorial from the Wall Street Journal of yesterday's date, outlining one of the more extraordinary results the Board has reached when applying its own peculiar interpretations of statutory law. I believe that when the Board can produce results like this, it is high time for Congress to take seriously its obligation to investigate the way in which the independent agencies are applying the law of the land.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIKE THE OLD SHELL GAME

This particular labor relations case is almost as baffling as the old shell game, which over the years has befuddled so many rubes.

It involves the employees of two Nashville, Tenn., supermarkets, under one management. Now there are two ways an employer can be required to recognize that his employees want a union and hence be required to bargain with them. One is by a secret ballot election as provided by Congress. The other is by the use of "union authorization cards" as permitted by rulings of the National Labor Relations Board.

If a union can get a majority of a company's employees to sign authorization cards, according to NLRB policy it can demand that the employer recognize and bargain with it, dispensing with a formal election.

In the case of the supermarkets, the AFL-CIO Meat Cutters Union openly conducted an organizing campaign, demanding recognition and bargaining on the basis of signed authorization cards. When the employer, however, asked for an NLRB election, the meat cutters threatened to strike. So to avoid a tieup and all the legal fuss insistence on a secret ballot election would entail, the markets agreed to accept the signed cards as evidence of the employees' intentions, provided the cards were checked by an independent labor relations representative.

The check was made, the consultant reporting that the union had valid signed authorization cards from 42 of the 78 employees in the two stores. The employer therefore bargained with the meat cutters and signed a contract with them.

Now enters the AFL-CIO Retail Clerks Union. It seems that while the meat cutters were holding their organizing campaign, the retail clerks secretly were conducting a campaign of their own to obtain signed authorization cards and held cards from 15 of the 42 workers who had signed the meat cutters' cards. In short, some employees had signed cards of two different unions.

The NLRB then did the only thing it could do: It ruled that the 15 cards could not be counted for any union. That, of course, denied the meat cutters a majority. But the NLRB went further. Although it conceded that the employer, unaware of the duplications, had acted in good faith, the board held this was immaterial and charged the employer with granting recognition to a minority union and hence with violation of the labor laws.

Plainly, when an employer unwittingly can get himself into such a position, the NLRB's policy of permitting union recognition through the signing of cards ought to be thrown out, and all recognition and bargaining cases resolved by secret ballot as Congress intended all along. Otherwise, how is an employer to know under which shell a union is hiding the pea?

RECESS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 1:30 p.m.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.) the Senate took a recess.

The Senate reassembled at 1:30 p.m., when called to order by Mr. RANDOLPH.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE GOLD CRISIS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, as gold buying on the London market reached record proportions on Thursday, March 14, the Senate, by a margin of 39 to 37, voted to remove the 25-percent gold cover. At that time apparently the theory behind this administration request was that by freeing U.S. gold from reserve requirements, all the some \$11.4 billion of gold bullion currently in the U.S. Treasury could be used to stem the speculation.

Previously, by the same narrow vote of 39 to 37, the Senate rejected an amendment that I both spoke for and voted for; which amendment would have prevented the exchange of dollars for our gold by foreign countries during the time their debts to the United States were in arrears.

If the misfortune of a monetary crisis has to occur, it would appear preferable to face it at a time when we have over \$11 billion of gold bullion in the Treasury, instead of after our gold has run out. The latter possibility is far more than theory because, alone among the nations of the world, this Government continues to sell gold for \$35 an ounce, far under the current market price.

Another problem incident to our having already lost over half of our gold in recent years—\$13 billion—is the continuing deficit in our international balance of payments, a situation about which I have been speaking continuously on the floor of the Senate for many years.

In the first of a series of five Senate statements on the balance-of-payments problem made in 1963, I recommended a number of actions, including a long overdue substantial reduction of our troops in Europe. This has not occurred however; in fact, no truly effective steps of any kind have been taken in an effort to reduce this payment deficit. Since 1963, when I voiced my first warning, our gold supply has decreased many additional billions of dollars.

Over the past weekend, the seven members of the international gold pool met in Washington and agreed to establish a two-price system in gold transactions. Basically, they agreed that first, the price of gold for Government dealings would remain at \$35 an ounce; second, the price of gold in the private market would be determined by supply and demand; and, third, the central banks involved will no longer sell gold to private users, or to any central bank which sells gold on the private market.

The central bank of France, as well as the central banks of other countries not party to the agreement, can purchase gold from the U.S. Treasury at the official rate of \$35 an ounce, provided there is no evidence of that central bank in question selling gold from its official reserves to private speculators.

The difficulty will be identification of gold in the private market that might have come from central banks; and as yet no "policing" system has been agreed to.

Some policing method would seem vital so as to assure that the \$11.4 billion

of U.S. gold stock, recently made available as the result of the removal of the gold cover, does not end up in the hands of speculators.

Members of the banking and business communities of both the United States and Europe, however, view the actions taken this past weekend as no more than a prelude to the need for more meaningful actions on the part of the U.S. fiscal and monetary authorities to stem the further outflow of gold and thereby improve the balance of payments.

In this connection, one fact already stands out clearly; namely, the United States, although a strong nation, has limited resources; therefore priorities must be established. As example, there must be decision as to whether or not carrying out programs considered essential in this country and other countries are, or are not, more important than carrying out the present programs in Vietnam.

I do not believe that this economy can handle both; and it is now clear that words alone are no longer respected by our foreign creditors as a substitute for action.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent that an article with a London dateline by Anthony Lewis from the New York Times of March 18, entitled "The Vulnerable Dollar," be inserted in the RECORD at the end of these remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, this matter is one of considerable importance to every American. As evidence of that fact, I ask that a column by Sylvia Porter, entitled "On the Dollar-Gold Crisis," also be inserted in the RECORD at the end of these remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York Times, Mar. 18, 1968]

THE VULNERABLE DOLLAR: EUROPEANS GRIMLY SATISFIED BY REALITY THAT EVEN U.S. POWER HAS LIMITATIONS

(By Anthony Lewis)

LONDON, March 17.—In Europe this weekend there can be detected, along with deep uncertainty and fear about the future of the world monetary system, a certain grim satisfaction.

The satisfaction stems from the present demonstration that the United States is vulnerable to economic realities just as other countries are. The feeling to some extent reflects envy, which is hardly surprising. Europeans have seen their currencies tremble so often while the American dollar stood apparently unshakable. Now the dollar is in trouble.

But more than envy is involved. Among financial experts here and on the Continent there is a strong belief that Americans must learn to accept the fact that there are limitations even on the power of their country.

Bankers and Treasury officials on this side of the Atlantic see this possible value in the current bitter lesson for the United States, and not because they are anti-American—far from it. Rather, they think Americans have been far too slow to recognize the gravity of the threat to world finance and to recognize their responsibility for it.

The Sunday Times reflected this today. "British economic incompetence somewhat pales," it observed, beside American "in-

souciance in face of the threat to the dollar."

IMPACT ON CONFIDENCE

In London and Zurich—not just in Paris—financial leaders have harsh words for the economic policy of the United States. They have been particularly troubled by the seeming indifference over a long period to the impact on world confidence of the continuing United States balance-of-payments deficit and gold drain.

The war in Vietnam is the largest single cause of concern in the European financial community. The feeling is that the American Government has never faced up realistically to the cost.

It was nearly two years after the major escalation of the war started in 1965, the financial experts note, before President Johnson even asked for a tax increase. They are astounded that the United States can continue intensifying the war while failing to raise taxes, and still enjoy the most lavish domestic consumption in the world's history.

EFFECTS ON OPINION

Even now, with the monetary crisis at hand, the Europeans are not sure that the President and his advisers are sufficiently aware of the effects on financial opinion of what they do in Vietnam.

A Johnson Administration's decision on a moderate increase in American troop strength, perhaps 35,000 to 50,000 men, was reported over the weekend. With sensitivities as they are here, the cost of even that could wipe out—in confidence—the benefits of severe spending cuts and a tax increase if the President finally gets one from the Congress.

But the concern here about the attitude of the United States toward the developing financial crisis in recent years and months goes beyond President Johnson to the American people. The impression is that Americans wanted to believe that they could go on living better than any people in history, that the dollar could never be dethroned and that the rules of monetary discipline did not apply to the United States.

DESTROYING ILLUSIONS

If so, the experience of the last week may in the long run have the favorable effect of destroying illusions, or so it is hoped in Europe.

Now the mighty dollar is suddenly seen by Americans to be like other currencies—only as strong as confidence in the economy supporting it. The American tourist who could not cash a traveler's check in London or Paris this weekend got an unforgettable demonstration of that truth.

The many stories of Americans having their dollars refused at hotels or airports undoubtedly are giving Europeans a kick. But there is still the realization that all of the Western countries are in this crisis with the United States and depend on its success in meeting the challenge.

The British popular newspapers are proclaiming "This Black Weekend" and reporting on "Your Money—These Men Are Deciding About It Now." The theme is that prosperity in Britain and, even a decent life, may depend on what happens in Washington.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Roy Jenkins, undoubtedly recognizes more acutely than anyone the interdependence of this country with the United States.

He is scheduled to present his first budget to Parliament on Tuesday, and nearly everyone here is looking to it for decisions that could make or break Britain economically. Yet it appears that Mr. Jenkins' best may be swamped by what the United States does about economic policy.

ACCIDENT OF TIMING

Not that the British budget is unimportant. Many people, including experts on the United States economy, think that the accident of timing gives Mr. Jenkins a great op-

portunity to start the process of restoring world confidence in the monetary system.

As The Sunday Telegraph put it today, he has the chance of "getting a grip, of acting firmly, of demonstrating that a rational financial system is being rationally run." That means showing a willingness to accept tough medicine—higher taxes and postponed hopes for social improvements.

But, according to some informed European opinion, it is pre-eminently the Americans who must now adjust their economic dreams to reality. The reality is that the United States is not omnipotent, in financial matters any more than in others.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the Evening Star, Mar. 18, 1968]

ON THE DOLLAR-GOLD CRISIS

(By Sylvia Porter)

What do the proposed solutions to the worldwide stampede for gold mean to the free world in general, to you in particular? How will the moves to be made now to save the U.S. dollar affect your money in the bank, your take-home pay, cost of living, savings, mortgage and other loans? Why did so massive an effort to dump dollars and buy gold develop anyway?

Late yesterday afternoon, the leading central banks of the free world—with the conspicuous exception of France—gave their answer to the speculators who have been staging an historic run on gold in an attempt to force the U.S. to raise its official price above 35 dollars an ounce and thereby devalue the dollar. That answer, hammered out by the U.S., Belgium, the Netherlands, West Germany, Italy, Switzerland and Britain during weekend emergency meetings in Washington is:

The U.S. will not change the official price and qualified foreign holders of dollars will be able to continue turning in their dollars on demand for our gold at 35 dollars an ounce; the central bankers, though, will stop selling gold to or buying gold from private sources and the price of gold in the world's free markets will be allowed to find its own level.

MEANS MANY THINGS

And to you? To you this means many things.

To begin with, though, it does not mean the value or the appearance of the dollar in your pocketbook or the bank will be changed. There is no possibility of any flight from the dollar to gold within our country; you haven't been able to buy gold legally since 1934. There is no danger of a bank panic. The stories you've heard about this sort of thing in recent days are uninformed at best, malicious nonsense at worst.

But your take-home pay almost surely will be cut by higher income and excise taxes. An income tax increase is now a symbol of U.S. fiscal responsibility and the odds are growing fast that congress will soon vote to hike taxes on corporation and individual incomes to help balance the federal budget and slow down the economy's pace of rise.

Your cost of living will continue to climb to all-time peaks, though, because none of the restraints on the way can eliminate war-inspired price-wage pressures. Your dollar's buying power will continue to sink to all-time lows.

You will find borrowing money increasingly tough and more expensive. The federal reserve system is turning the credit screws again in its own drive to protect the dollar by curtailing borrowing which might feed inflation. The discount rate—the basic borrowing rate of the nation—has been raised to 5 percent, highest level in nearly four decades, and it could be on the way to 5½ percent. All other borrowing rates to businessmen, individuals, homebuilders, and buyers—scale up and up from there.

You will find it particularly difficult to finance a house—to build or buy or even sell one without assured mortgage financing.

Efforts are being made to prevent home-building from going into a tailspin as during 1966's credit "crunch." But the federal reserve system cannot insulate housing from credit forces as powerful as it has just set into motion. The price of mortgage money will jump and become scarcer.

You will be able to earn peak rates on your savings in the bank, savings institution, U.S. government, corporation and municipal bonds. Borrowers in the open market—ranging from the U.S. treasury down—are now paying historically high rates on their new issues. Rates on top-grade obligations are moving into the 6-7 percent range. The return to investors in the 50 percent tax bracket on blue-chip tax-exempt securities is moving beyond 10 percent. If there is a threat of great outflows of funds from financial institutions in the search of the more favorable rates, the federal reserve will permit the institutions to hike the rates they pay on savings.

You will pay more for items made of gold or including gold as a major ingredient. Private industrial users or gold jewelry manufacturers no longer will be protected by the U.S. treasury's fixed \$35 dollars gold price.

You will face a rising possibility of wartime price-wage-credit controls. The last pretense that we can afford all the butter along with the guns was pulverized by the gold speculators last week—and yesterday our friends among the free nations made sure we realize that.

CLOSELY CONNECTED

You could find buying imported goods more expensive—despite the fact that a round of tariff cuts is underway. A surtax on imports is a possibility to discourage our buying.

Some of these implications to your pocket-book may seem far removed from a run on gold in markets 3,000 miles away from New York, but they are in fact directly and closely connected.

For bluntly what happened to our dollar—meaning us—last week was this:

The world gave our policies abroad and at home a massive vote of no-confidence—and for the first time in our modern history, we were put on the defensive.

With the help of the six nations that with us formed the now disbanded "gold pool," we temporarily shored up the international monetary system yesterday and bought more time for us to act to defend our dollar.

Now a new transition phase in world monetary affairs opens. Now we either come through and restore confidence in the dollar by actions which count—or we invite a breakdown in the monetary system and resulting chaos.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 2318) for the relief of Kelley Michelle Auerbach.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1664) for the relief of the city of El Dorado, Kans., with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 202. An act to amend section 2735 of title 10 of the United States Code; to provide for the finality of settlement effected under section 2733, 2734, 2734a, 2734b, or 2737;

H.R. 14681. An act to declare a portion of

Boston Inner Harbor and Fort Point Channel nonnavigable;

H.R. 14922. An act to amend Public Law 90-60 with respect to judgment funds of the Ute Mountain Tribe; and

H.R. 15004. An act to further amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to extend the expiration date of certain authorities thereunder, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 657) providing for ceremonies in the rotunda of the Capitol in connection with the unveiling of the bust of Constantino Brumidi, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

S. 793. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the Alabama Space Science Exhibit Commission;

S. 876. An act relating to Federal support of education of Indian students in sectarian institutions of higher education; and

S. 2336. An act to determine the respective rights and interests of the Confederate Tribes of the Colville Reservation and the Yakima Tribes of Indians of the Yakima Reservation and their constituted tribal groups in and to a judgment fund on deposit in the Treasury of the United States, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 202. An act to amend section 2735 of title 10 of the United States Code, to provide for the finality of settlement effected under section 2733, 2734, 2734a, 2734b, or 2737; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14681. An act to declare a portion of Boston Inner Harbor and Fort Point Channel nonnavigable; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 14922. An act to amend Public Law 90-60 with respect to judgment funds of the Ute Mountain Tribe; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 15004. An act to further amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to extend the expiration date of certain authorities thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 657) providing for ceremonies in the rotunda of the Capitol in connection with the unveiling of the bust of Constantino Brumidi, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATORIAL STANDARDS OF CONDUCT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 266) to provide standards of conduct for Members of the Senate and officers and employees of the Senate.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Senator from Nevada desires to offer an amendment. Other amendments also will be offered, but Senators are not ready at this time to present them. I believe the Senator from Nevada will be in the Chamber in 15 minutes.

Under the circumstances, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate suspend its proceedings now and resume at 2:15 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it the Senator's intention to ask for a recess subject to the call of the Chair?

Mr. STENNIS. I wish to cooperate with the Parliamentarian. I move that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Thereupon (at 2 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.) the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate reassembled at 2:35 p.m. when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. BURDICK in the chair).

AMENDMENTS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator will be stated.

The bill clerk read the amendments, as follows:

On page 4, line 3, after the word "Senator," and on page 5, line 17, after the word "Senator," and on page 7, line 23, after the word, "Senator," insert the following: "Or person who has declared or otherwise made known his intention to seek nomination or election, or who has filed papers or petitions for nomination or election, or on whose behalf a declaration or nominating paper or petition has been made or filed, or who has otherwise, directly or indirectly, manifested his intention to seek nomination or election, pursuant to State law, to the office of United States Senator."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator wish his amendments considered en bloc?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, my amendment pertains to three different parts of the resolution. It is only one amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It requires unanimous consent to consider it as one.

Mr. CANNON. I ask unanimous consent that my amendment, which would appear at three different places in the resolution, may be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, this amendment is intended to perfect Senate resolution 266 in its application to those persons who would be affected by proposed new Senate rules XLII, XLIII, and XLIV in the pending resolution.

Candidates for nomination or election should be required to comply with the provisions of these rules even as present incumbents of the Senate.

Each adversary in a senatorial election campaign should have available information concerning the business and financial activities and interests of all of his opponents. To deny to an incumbent the right to know as much data about his opponent as is required by Senate resolution 266 from the incumbent would be obviously unfair and discriminatory.

It could be argued that a Senate resolution lacks inherent power or jurisdiction over persons outside the Senate, but under the U.S. Constitution, the Senate is the sole judge of the elections and qualifications of its Members.

When a successful candidate presents his credentials to the Senate, this body has the right to inquire whether he has complied with the provisions of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act in filing reports of his campaign finances with the Senate and whether all other prerequisites have been met. If such a candidate were informed of the existence of a Senate rule, just as he is notified of his duty to file under the Corrupt Practices Act, I feel sure he would comply with the proper spirit.

I read from the Constitution, section 5 of article I:

Each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own members, and a majority of each shall constitute a quorum to do business; but a smaller number may adjourn from day to day, and may be authorized to compel the attendance of absent members, in such manner, and under such penalties as each House may provide.

Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings, punish its members for disorderly behavior, and, with the concurrence of two-thirds, expel a member—

And so on. I think it is quite clear that each body—or the Senate in particular in this instance—would have the right to determine whether or not a man had complied with the resolution as expressed by the Senate, even though it did not have the effect of law. If a man does not comply and runs and is defeated, the issue would not arise.

But if he should run and not make that information public, he obviously would be taking an advantage, if it may be termed an advantage, over an incumbent running for office, who is required by the resolution to make that information public.

I hope, Mr. President, that the distinguished chairman of the committee will accept my amendment. I believe, in all fairness, that it is a good amendment and that it should be accepted.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator's amendment presents a very solid, substantial point, which I think in theory has a good deal of merit. The question that we considered and passed on with reference to that matter, was that these are merely Senate rules; they are not, properly speaking, legislation. They will not be passed upon by the House of Representatives, like a bill or joint resolution, nor will they be signed by the President of

the United States. We concluded to present the matter in the form of amendments to the Senate rules, thus letting them apply only to us as Members of the Senate.

The Senator is passing over the substance of the matter, and looking at the effect. He in effect proposes, in his amendment, that someone who is not a Member of the Senate and may never be a Member of the Senate be required, nevertheless, to come in and comply with a Senate rule, before he can become a candidate for the Senate in his own State, under the State laws and the Corrupt Practices Act laws of the United States—laws, I repeat, not rules of the Senate.

That raises a very far-reaching legal question. My impression is that the Senate rules cannot go that far. That is what has concerned me all the time. I wish we could take jurisdiction of that very problem the Senator has so well pointed out, and make the requirements identical. I think the Senator is resourceful, and shows considerable ingenuity and legal reasoning to reach over here and take that provision in the Constitution and tie it in with whether or not a man will be permitted to sit, the Senate being the judge of the qualifications of its Members, including both those Members who come in for the first time and those who return for a new term.

I should be glad to hear, and I feel that other members of the committee would be glad to hear the Senator further on the legal question. I wish I could agree with him, but I cannot, as I see it now, that we have jurisdiction, in proceedings under the Senate rules, to reach these problems. Under the Senator's wording, I think the matter would be well covered, but I believe we would be enacting something that would not stand the test of a legal contest.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Nevada has the floor.

Mr. PEARSON. Will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. CANNON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. PEARSON. I say to the Senator from Nevada that I am very happy with what he is trying to do. As the chairman knows, we spent many hours trying to find some means of covering exactly this situation. It represents nothing more and nothing less than fairness.

I ask the Senator, is the reason that he did not rely upon introducing and having passed a statute covering the matter because such a bill, to become law, would have to pass both Houses of Congress, and we would thus have the House of Representatives passing upon a requirement for being a Member of the Senate?

Mr. CANNON. I might ask the committee the same question, as to why they did not propose a bill rather than a resolution.

I would much have preferred to see it in the form of a bill, because I have another amendment in which I am very much interested, and which I intend to offer as a sense of the Senate resolution, but which I would like to have offered as

an amendment to a bill, because it would apply to the executive and judicial branches as well as to the legislative branch, including the other body. Under the pending resolution that amendment obviously cannot be offered because this is a simple Senate resolution.

I have checked this matter with the Parliamentarian. To answer the Senator's question, this provision does not apply to the House of Representatives; it has no application to the House. It would provide that the same thing we are saying applies to a Senator must also apply to a man who is an announced Senate candidate.

That, in all fairness, seems to me to be a valid application. I agree, as stated earlier, that it would not have the effect of law. If a man files or announces for the Senate, and runs and is defeated, there is not a thing we can do about it. But I may say to the Senator that even if it were merely passed and on the books as a rule of the Senate, I think it could have a salutary effect on any person who may become a candidate for the Senate for him to know, on becoming a candidate, that if he should win he is on notice that he is required by the Senate rules to comply with that provision of the rules, and if he does not comply with it, then he is on notice, certainly, that the Constitution says that each House shall be the judge of the election returns and the qualifications of its own Members.

This body can determine that. If they determine that a man took an unfair advantage, and did not comply with the Senate rule and got elected, they could decide not to seat him. That could be done, Mr. President. That is sort of a long way around to answer the Senator's question, but I would say again that I would prefer, myself, that this were a joint resolution, or were proposed as a bill. But I am confronted here with the problem of addressing myself to a resolution reported out by the distinguished Senator's committee; and trying to get that resolution in a form which I think will be fair.

The second proposal to which I have referred is not a new resolution on my part. I proposed it long ago, when we were previously considering the question of ethics. It would simply provide that members of the executive and judicial branches be subject to the same limitations; and I shall propose it again before we finish with this matter.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I say again I concur with what the Senator is trying to do. I think it might have some influence on candidates, but I do not think it would have any significant effect in the long run.

We faced the same problems in the committee which the Senator faces now. He has resolved to go a little bit further than we were resolved to go when faced with the same issue. I would respond to his question as to why the committee did not come out with a bill by saying it was fundamentally because, in the first, early consideration, in proposing some sort of code, we considered, alternatively, a statute and code of ethics, and, after discussion, selected amendment of the rules as the manner in which we would seek to do it. I am not

sure that the committee as such, under the rules that created it, really has the power to propose legislation or bring to the floor a statute.

But I congratulate the Senator for making a very good try on a very difficult problem. In fact, I go further, and say that I have a great deal of sympathy with his other proposed sense of the Senate resolution, since both Houses should have the same ethics applied to them. If he proceeds in that manner, there would be no problem about a bill as a supplement to a Senate code of ethics.

I think, however, that we had better address ourselves to that matter when the Senator brings up the resolution to which he refers. I frankly and honestly agree with what the Senator is trying to do, but such action, although it may have some influence on the matter, would really have no effect in the long run.

Mr. CANNON. The whole thing that we are trying to accomplish is the adoption of a resolution that will have some influence on the Members of the Senate, that will influence them in the conduct of the office they hold, and that will permit the public to be better informed.

I think it has been said before in the course of the debate on this matter that if there are people who want to evade the provisions laid down, they will find ways to do it. However, I proceed on the assumption that if the Senate acts on this matter and provides in the form of a Senate rule that persons who desire to become candidates should do certain prescribed things, such persons will do those things. And I believe they will.

I believe in all fairness that we should shorten the resolution and make certain changes to make it broader. I think the resolution should apply to other persons as well.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I know that the Senator is a very able and distinguished lawyer. I have worked with him on committees, and I have some appreciation for his talent in this field.

I think one of the fundamental legal principles of any court in the issuance of any order is whether it is feasible of execution and enforcement.

The Senator from Nevada is also a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration. I ask him, in light of that, if we had a given case in which a candidate refused, in spite of the existence of this proposed rule, to comply with the rule and was successful in his campaign for the U.S. Senate, and the Rules and Administration Committee had before it the question of whether that man should be seated in view of his violation of this rule in spite of his contention that the rule did not apply to him because he was not a Member of the U.S. Senate, whether we would not have a very difficult proposition pending before the Committee on Rules and Administration.

I go back to another element of the difficulty. What we do will have to be feasible and subject to enforcement.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, this would not have to be a Senate rule. It could be just a simple Senate resolution, independent and apart from the rules.

The Senator referred to meeting the court test. I think it is now quite clear historically that the Senate is in charge of determining the right of its own Members to be seated. They would not follow the court test. The Senate is the judge, and the courts cannot go into the matter.

Mr. PEARSON. I agree.

Mr. CANNON. And if the Senate has said it believes that a man who is a candidate should make the same information public that an incumbent who is running for reelection should make public, and if the opponent were elected and did not comply with this resolution or with the rule of the Senate, whichever way it happened to be, that is a matter that would be certainly proper to be presented to the Committee on Rules and Administration and to the Senate in determining the right to be seated of that particular person after an election.

Mr. PEARSON. I do not mean to imply that we are getting into principles of law in this connection. However, I use that as an illustration to show the great burden that the Committee on Rules and Administration will run up against in that situation. It will be awfully difficult, and I know that the Senator has recognized this. He has indicated as much in presenting his amendment.

Mr. CANNON. We have a subcommittee of the Committee on Rules and Administration specifically appointed for that purpose. And we do make investigations based upon charges that are presented. Complaints are made to the effect that a person has done things in the course of his election that he should not have done, that he has violated the Corrupt Practices Act, or whatever the case may be. The subcommittee of the Committee on Rules and Administration then goes into the matter and makes its report to the parent committee, the Committee on Rules and Administration, in an effort to determine whether that person is entitled to be seated under the Constitution.

Mr. PEARSON. That is precisely correct. I put to the Senator another case, the case of a contest between two candidates for the U.S. Senate, one of whom has fully complied with the rules because he is an incumbent, and the other of whom has not complied with the rules. If the incumbent files a complaint with the subcommittee, what could the subcommittee do? The incumbent is a Member of the Senate and the candidate is not.

Mr. CANNON. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Rules and Administration that handles that matter, we have been confronted with exactly that situation in which a complaint has been filed with us to protest the election of a candidate, and because the complaint did not meet the requirements that the Committee on Rules and Administration had established for the presentation of the complaint, we did not hear the complaint in two or three instances. So this matter has obviously quite a clear precedent, I think.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I have the Senator's amendment in my hand, and I notice that the way in which the

amendment is written it applies to those actions required by the resolution for reporting to the Comptroller. That is, it refers to page 5, line 17, and to page 7, line 23. However, I notice that it does not refer to the reports required on page 8 under (a) and (b), and if the Senator would indulge me for a moment at this point because I think it is very pertinent, I think one of the main difficulties that would arise from the adoption of this amendment is the fact that if a man or a woman reports under paragraph (a) on page 8 to the Secretary of the Senate, he is thereafter going to be continually bombarded by crackpots about the connections of any contribution with his subsequent votes. For example, I can easily see a situation in which a man might receive, if the people in his State had faith in him, a contribution from certain people who were connected with airlines, and at the same time he might receive contributions from men who worked for railroads, and perhaps also at the same time he might receive contributions from people who worked for trucking companies.

That would be a classic instance in which the interested parties were competitive in the economic field; yet a contribution from a member of any of those groups could appear to affect anything done on the floor of the Senate which might touch, or barely touch, any of those groups, and thus leave the Senator wide open to vituperous and bitter criticism. Would not the Senator agree to that?

Mr. CANNON. I am not trying to defend, at this time, the position taken by the chairman or the other members of the committee. The Senator's argument relates, I think, to the basic position taken by the committee. I simply say that if the rule is to apply to Senators, it should likewise apply to candidates.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator's amendment, as I read it, does not refer to subparagraph (3) at the foot of page 7 and continuing to paragraph (a) on page 8.

Mr. CANNON. Yes; it does apply. If the Senator will note the amendment, it reads:

And on page 7, line 23 after the word, "Senator," insert the following:

So it does apply on line 23, page 7, and continuing on page 8. I have tried to make the language apply consistently throughout the resolution.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is correct. I have reexamined the amendment; I now have a copy of it. But that report is required to have been filed on May 15 of each year. So the person who is running, under the Senator's amendment, or the person who is challenging, would be required to file only up to May 15, as would be the incumbent himself.

Mr. CANNON. That is correct. The application would be equal.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me on one point?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I wish to underscore again the real problem the Senator from Nevada has so well stated with reference

to the intentions and purposes of the amendment. The committee joins thoroughly in the desire to reach this problem.

I might digress for a moment to the question of having the rules apply to the House as well as to the Senate, and let the proposal be a law instead of rules. Such a proposal has a tremendous appeal and has some advantages. But the Senate is an institution that has existed for almost 200 years without having any written rules on the subject. We considered the idea of consulting with the committee of the House of Representatives to see what could be done about adopting rules to apply to both Houses. They have a committee similar to ours.

In the first place, the problems are greatly different. The problems of regulation are different with reference to those who are candidates for the House of Representatives and those who are candidates for the Senate. The customs and problems are different with respect to statewide races.

These hearings and the probing into these matters have indicated where the real problems lie. They are so different that it is clear to us that a joint effort would take a great deal of time.

I believe the members of the committee in the House of Representatives have substantially the same view, because we discussed this matter with them informally to some extent. It would take a great deal of time to delve into this matter and determine what the problems are and then try to work out arrangements and agreements and language that would cover all the problems.

It would take not a few months, but a few years, and the matter would be delayed a long time and probably misunderstood.

Because neither House has any experience in this field of written regulations, it was believed to be far better to make a start, first with our own rules, and then the House with its rules, as to the problems which were paramount, important, and needed immediate attention. It was felt that once a start had been made by each House, then, as we moved forward, there would be far better chance for a sound blending, based on experience, of some of those major rules or regulations, or whatever they may be called, if it was the desire of either House to blend them into law. In that way, the opportunity to cover items such as the Senator from Nevada has brought up would be greatly increased.

So that basic decision was made, and I believe that time has proved that it was the right decision. If we can enact some rules and regulations and the House can enact some and then try them out, so to speak, we believe that we will progress splendidly in developing the responsible rules and regulations. That basic decision having been made, we are bound by that here, and I do not believe we can ride both horses.

If we are traveling on Senate rules, we cannot come in and say, "Yes, but that is inadequate, and we are going to bring in something that ought to be a law."

However well it is worded or however good its intentions or soundness in logic,

when you add this amendment, it is not law, and it is really not a rule pertaining to Senators.

In the limiting of rules pertaining to Senators or employees who are associated with the Senate, it does not have the force of law. It would not be respected, in my humble judgment, by the courts. They would spew it out of their mouths, so to speak, and say that it is a nullity so far as being binding on someone who is not yet a Member of the Senate.

I do not believe there is any way we can reach out and get the analogy here of looking into the qualifications of a man to be a Senator and excluding him on the ground that he did not comply with what we added to a rule of the Senate, which really was not a rule of the Senate, but was a rule for candidates for the office of Senator.

I believe that would be a great error, and we would invite criticism, and we would invite repudiation by the courts. I wish we could get to the matter.

I distinctly remember one day during all the ups and downs we have had, when I was in the cloakroom, trying to reach the Senator from Nevada on the telephone to ask him about his Subcommittee on Rules going into this question.

The Senator from Nevada was conducting hearings at the time, and I did not disturb him. I just did not get around to calling him. I mention that only to indicate that we were looking to the Senator from Nevada in connection with this problem, but to handle it on the basis of a law, and I believe that is the only way we can get to it. We would be tempted to go into the other fields, other subjects, if we adopted one.

I agree with the merits and much of the substance of the amendment, but I believe we are dutybound at this stage of the proceedings to oppose the amendment as a part of the rules of the Senate.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I regret that the Senator from Mississippi was not able to get in touch with me for a discussion of this matter, because I have been here for a considerable period of time and have been available for discussion.

Mr. STENNIS. I did not make such a suggestion. I said that I called the Senator and he was conducting a hearing. It was during the time when we were trying to finish up, and there was no opportunity to consult further with the Senator.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, to suggest that the courts would not look with favor on this type of proposal is quite inconsistent with the facts. The courts have looked on a number of occasions—or have been petitioned to look—at the question of whether or not they could determine the right of a person elected to the office of Senator to be seated. The courts unanimously have held that, pursuant to the Constitution, this is not a matter for the courts; that it is a matter for the Senate to determine. And there are precedents in the Senate itself.

When a purported Senator was duly elected—I should not say "duly," but at least was elected—to come to the Senate, the Senate refused to seat him. That is a historical precedent. And the Senate can refuse to seat a man who purportedly

has been elected, either with or without a Senate rule.

So I am simply saying that if we are going to make an application in this instance that applies to Senators, we should prescribe the same provision with respect to announced candidates for the Senate.

I know that it does not have the force of law and that if you are going to try to punish him, you cannot punish him. But there is no such provision in the proposed resolution. I believe this would have a salutary effect, to require him to make public the information that should be made public under the proposed resolution. He would know that if he did not do it, he would run the risk of not being seated pursuant to section 5 of the Constitution.

Almost every election year, some sort of matter has come up before the Rules Committee involving the question of whether or not persons have violated the election laws, whether they are duly elected, whether it is a matter that the Senate Rules Committee should investigate.

We have conducted investigations on occasion in order to determine those facts. As I stated earlier, we have refused investigations in certain instances because the complaint did not conform to the ground rules set up by the Committee on Rules and Administration with respect to contesting an election. So there is no question about the validity of such a provision here if the Senate wishes to adopt it, and I think in all fairness the Senate should adopt it. We are not trying to impose anything on another body, but only on an applicant, a person who is a declared candidate for the Senate. I do not see why we should not apply it to Joe Doaks, who has said he is going to be a candidate, and yet apply the rule to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] who is running for reelection from the State of Kentucky. The same rules should apply to both of them.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Nevada has the floor.

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I, too, would agree that the Senator's purpose is correct; and if the Senate should adopt the committee's recommendation applying to incumbent Senators, it would be reasonable to apply a similar rule to candidates, if we could do it legally or effectively.

I would say that the responsibility of our committee was to recommend rules to the Senate dealing with conduct of Members of the Senate, and officers and employees of the Senate. That does not mean to say we could not have recommended that the Committee on Rules and Administration hold hearings on the Senator from Nevada's proposal and report to the Senate a bill which would place the same obligations upon all candidates.

The Senator will agree with me that the Committee on Rules and Administration, which has jurisdiction in this area could recommend an amendment to the Corrupt Practices Act requiring all can-

didates for the Senate and House to meet the same requirements that would be imposed upon Members of the Senate by Senate Resolution 266. That is the only way it would have any legal effect, if properly recommended by the committee, approved by the Senate and the House of Representatives, and then signed by the President.

The Senator has said, and I believe correctly, that under the Constitution the Committee on Privileges and Elections can inquire into the qualifications of a person who has been elected to the Senate, and recommend to the Senate that the person be not seated. There are at least two grounds on which a person could be denied a seat in the Senate. The first ground would be if he had violated the Corrupt Practices Act and the Senator's committee could recommend that the Senator not be seated where violations were found.

Another ground on which a successful candidate could be denied a seat would be if his public or private conduct were of a corrupt and notorious nature.

However, if a candidate, who was not required to do so by law, had failed to file a disclosure statement then I do not believe it would be grounds for refusing him a seat in the Senate, if he were not an incumbent Senator to whom the rule applies.

The amendment of the Senator from Nevada would not have any legal effect and I do not believe the failure to file a disclosure statement by a candidate who is not an incumbent Senator would be grounds for refusing him a seat in the Senate. The only effective way to reach this question would be for the Senate's Committee on Rules and Administration to prepare such an amendment to the Corrupt Practices Act and recommend the measure to the Senate. If the Senate and the House of Representatives were to agree to such an amendment and if signed by the President, it would have the full effect of law.

Mr. President, I wish to make one final statement. I think it rather inappropriate for us to begin to attempt to impose requirements on nonincumbent candidates by rule until such time as we adopt them for ourselves. We have not done this yet.

Mr. CANNON. I would say to the distinguished Senator, certainly if that is not done it would not apply to the people who are candidates, because the amendment I have proposed is written in such a way that it would include the Senator or a man who is a candidate.

If the Senate were to adopt this resolution with my amendment, it would apply to both people; and if the Senate were not to agree to the resolution, it would not apply to either. If the Senate were to vote affirmatively on my amendment, it would not make that approval apply if the basic resolution were turned down. This is simply an amendment. I submit it is clearly within the authority of the Senate.

The distinguished Senator pointed out it is only in extreme cases that Senators may be deprived of being seated. However, the point is that it has been done, and on a number of instances. Persons have been refused to be seated and

the courts cannot go into the matter. The sole judge of the question would be this body to determine the right of an applicant to be seated as a Member under the provisions of the Constitution which I read. It is pure and simple as to whether the Senate wants to make it apply to others, because to raise the specious question as to whether we can legally do so is not before us here. This could not be legally imposed on a Senator, as a matter of law; but it can be imposed upon him as a Senate resolution, and a Senator can be subjected to being punished, as a Senate rule, and he can be subjected to being punished by the Senate for violation of Senate rules; so we would also subject the applicant and candidate to the danger of having the Senate refuse to seat him if he did not comply, as an incumbent Senator is required to comply, with this rule when seeking election to office.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I think the Senator has raised a point which may be correct. I wish to acknowledge that it is true that the appropriate committee of the Senate could recommend and the Senate might deny seating a person elected to the Senate upon any grounds it thought sufficient, and without review of the courts. Is that the Senator's opinion?

Mr. CANNON. The Senator is correct. I think the court decisions are quite unanimous in that respect. I know of no contrary decision.

Mr. COOPER. I heard the Senator's argument when I came into the Chamber. My first impression was that we could not agree to the amendment as a part of the resolution; that we could only make a rule; and that the Senator's proposal would have no legal effect. It would not add anything to the body of law.

I assume the Senator is arguing that if we consider that the requirement for various forms of reporting and disclosure provided by the rules we have recommended are considered important enough by the Senate to be applied to incumbent Senators, then the Senator's committee and the Senate, if it desired, could deny a seat to the Senator who is not an incumbent, if he had not observed these rules. This may be correct, but I believe it would be bad policy to do so by rule rather than by an amendment to the Corrupt Practices Act which would establish legal requirements on all candidates. Is that the Senator's argument?

Mr. CANNON. That is correct. I think that the practical effect would be that when a man becomes a candidate he is notified of the rules of the Senate, and he would comply—as he should. Then we would have a candidate who was complying as well as an incumbent running for reelection who has complied. They are on the same basis. The public can judge between the two of them. They can determine within the guidelines of the resolution how the men are apt to be influenced, if at all, in the conduct of business, and not have one in a position of being at an unfair advantage over the other.

I believe that any man who intends to be a candidate for election, if he were informed of the existence of such a law, would obviously comply. He would not want to keep something like that secret from the public. If he did, and he was running against me, I would guarantee that the public would learn about it. I would have that right to let them know because they would be entitled to know that he had refused to comply with a rule of the Senate, that if he is going to run he has to do so on the same basis as any other candidate with respect to disclosing information to the public.

Mr. COOPER. I would think, perhaps, legally, the Senator has an argument; but I would say that there are different reasons for recommending this code and that it does not limit it to the questions of the candidacies but it goes to the Member of the Senate while he is in the Senate. First, there is a rule on conduct and, second, to provide to the public a belief and a confidence in the conduct of Members of this body. It is much larger in scope than just dealing with those who happen to be candidates. I still believe that the best way to handle the situation to which the Senator has addressed himself would be to amend the Corrupt Practices Act.

Mr. CANNON. I say to my distinguished colleague that both he and I are aware of the difficulties of getting changes made in the Corrupt Practices Act. We have tried for a number of years, and we have finally been successful in getting changes in the bill, but they are still languishing in the other body. They have not been acted on. The distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], a short while ago, raised that question with me and I did not answer it quite directly along that line. He questioned whether one of the reasons was that it was difficult to get this kind of action through the other body. I would say that we have been trying to amend the Corrupt Practices Act and trying to amend the Election Laws Act for many years and we have not been very successful, I may say, even though we have on several occasions passed a clean elections bill in this body. It is a difficult problem.

The distinguished Senator from Mississippi, a little while ago, stated that this was at least a beginning and let us get started. I say, let us get started and let us apply that start equally insofar as we can.

I have another amendment which I am going to propose a little later on, so that some of the arguments may be raised again; but that is a sense-of-the-Senate resolution. It is not so broad as what I am proposing now, because on this one, we would have some control through the Rules Committee, with the right of this body to determine the seating of its own Members.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. PEARSON. I want to say to the Senator again that I regret being in opposition to his amendment because it is the very essence of fairplay and equal treatment to any of those who seek a

seat in the Senate, whether an incumbent or a candidate.

The Senator is correct that it is very difficult to get legislation through. Once again, I want to compliment the Senator on handling a bill providing for corrections in campaign financing and election laws which the Senate passed but it still remains today in the House, if that is correct.

Mr. CANNON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PEARSON. There are problems connected with Corrupt Practices Act legislation, but there would also be other problems in legislation of this kind, if we sought to pass a law and place upon a candidate the requirements that exist in a code in the Senate rules which are subject to change from time to time. So that there are many problems involved here. But I would suggest to the Senator that, while I know he is going to press his amendment, we give some thought to preparing legislation in the form of the statute that would apply only to the Senate in relationship to the code we are considering, which I think the House might receive very favorably. Again, that is decidedly what we should do, but I disagree completely as to the feasibility and practicability of doing it in the manner the Senator proposes in his amendment.

Further, if the Senator finds my comments worth while, I would be very glad to join him in cosponsoring some kind of legislation, once we have accepted this resolution, which would apply to the Senate itself and would probably be received by the House with a great deal more friendship, perhaps, than a statute applying to both Houses.

Mr. CANNON. I thank the Senator for his kind offer, but I believe that Members of this body will see the equity of my position and will support my amendment to make it a part of the resolution.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I want to point out to the Senator that a moment ago I mentioned his contribution in this field. The committee took very favorable notice, indeed, of S. 1880, which was a bill passed last year by the Senate by a vote of 87 to 0, sponsored by the Senator from Nevada, in which he proposed the modernization of the Corrupt Practices Act. In that bill, which had tremendous appeal to the Senate, was also included the subject matter that covers situations similar to this. We reported this matter in our report, on page 11, and commended the bill, looking forward to the time when it would become law.

It reflects the creditable work that the Senator from Nevada has done, but it shows, as he said, that it is a subject for a law passed by Congress rather than for a rule of the Senate. So the Record ought to show that the Senator has worked further in this very field and that his amendment tends to confirm, I think, our position with reference to this subject.

Mr. CANNON. I would respond merely by saying that I cannot agree with the distinguished Senator from Mississippi that the amendment confirms the position of the committee on this subject, but it does certainly confirm the fact

that there is no question that the election laws of the country need revision and overhaul. This body demonstrated that clearly when it passed S. 1880 unanimously and sent it to the other body. We did adopt some changes in the Corrupt Practices Act, and we adopted some changes in the election laws.

But what we are considering today is making some changes in the Senate rules as they apply to Senators. I merely say that if we propose to change the rules as they relate to Senators during the periods of elections, the same rules should be applied to candidates for the Senate and not give them an unfair advantage, if it can be called an unfair advantage. There is no question that we have the legal right to do this. So the only question I can see is, Do we want to make the resolution fair in its application to persons who are seeking the office of U.S. Senator?

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I support the resolution before the Senate. It relates to a subject of great importance. Regardless of what this great body does on the many far-reaching proposals which are debated here, if the personal integrity of our membership is questioned by those we serve, the faith of the people in this institution will be shattered.

We live in perilous times. There is a growing mood of frustration across this land. Events in Vietnam, in our cities, in the world gold markets, and, indeed, in the American political arena have combined to create an increasing lack of assurance about things often taken for granted. In my judgment, there is an alarming trend among the people toward the fragmentation and disintegration of what once were accepted standards—standards once prevalent as guides for personal conduct, for political opinions, and for political action. For example, acceptance of our basic system of representative government once prevailed throughout the body politic. Now I seem to detect a lessening in public confidence in this system and its ability to solve the broad range of serious problems which confront the Nation and, indeed, the free world.

If this analysis is correct, then I believe it is essential that we follow a course of action which will serve as evidence to the American people that we, as their elected Representatives in the Senate, are concerned that ethical standards will prevail in the Senate. Let us show to the people that we are willing to pursue standards in the fulfillment of our duties which are above reproach. That in those areas where drawing a line may appear difficult to some, we will nevertheless draw a line.

Mr. President, I have long felt that the Senate should establish official standards of conduct. Senators' personal views of what is acceptable have differed and will continue to differ. Very distasteful and unfortunate incidents have come up in this body on the question of ethical behavior. One reason for this has been the lack of a clear definition by the Senate in certain areas.

My views, and those of other individual Senators, do not constitute an expressed code of conduct for the Senate. If the

Senate is to be conscientious in its quest for higher standards of conduct, its duty is to formulate an official code for the guidance of its Members. The Senate should now clearly set forth rules which will enable its Members to avoid engaging in a course of conduct which might be called into question at a later date.

It is not my intention to question the integrity of anyone. By setting clear standards of conduct in the areas of our official duties, the Senate will be providing a guide for its Members. We will also reassure the public that the Senate is concerned about ethics.

Let us also remember that the mere adoption of the resolution will not be enough. It is not enough to abide by the letter of law in these matters. The spirit of the law must be followed.

Mr. President, the resolution should be agreed to. In a time of tumultuous events, let the public be reassured that its institutions of government will adhere to a standard of integrity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum—

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that suggestion for a moment?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I want to thank the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] for his comments regarding the proposed code. I only rise to make that expression and also once again, in an effort to make some legislative history, to direct the attention of Senators and the Senate to paragraph (b) of the resolution, on the first page, wherein it is noted that these rules are the written expression of certain standards of conduct and complement the body of unwritten but generally accepted standards that continue to apply to the Senate.

While we have sought to lay down general guidelines within the matters taken up, they do not constitute, and we never intended them to constitute, the full and complete body of the code of conduct of any U.S. Senator. I do not think we can make that point too frequently in this particular debate, because it is of great consequence in the matters that may come before the Senate in the days ahead.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I simply say, in conclusion, there is no question that the Senate has the authority to amend the resolution as I have suggested and as this amendment proposes. The Constitution is clear that the Senate

could enforce it by questioning whether or not a person who might have violated a rule of the Senate was entitled to be seated. In all fairness, a rule that applies equally to a candidate for election to the Senate who is running for reelection, as against a man who is not running for the election, but where both are running for the same office, obviously should be given equal attention.

All my proposal does is make the rule apply equally to a Senator who is running for reelection and a man who may be an announced candidate for election to that office.

I ask that the Senate adopt my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, as far as a vote at this time is concerned, there are several amendments; and there has been an understanding that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] would have an opportunity to present two amendments that he has this afternoon. I am sure he will be here for that purpose as soon as we let him know.

I really believe, for the orderly handling of the resolution—and I hope the Senator from Nevada and the Senate will agree—that when the amendments have been presented, then we can propose a unanimous-consent request for a division of time as to amendments, with the major amendments having more time, of course, than others, and also have agreed time on passage of the resolution.

But until there is more time to arrange those details, and particularly right at this point, in order to comply with the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania, I hope that the Senator from Nevada will not insist upon voting.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I have no desire to rush the vote. If the Senate wishes, I shall ask unanimous consent that the order for the yeas and nays be rescinded, and withdraw my amendment for the moment, if the Senator from Mississippi would prefer to have some of the other amendments considered at this time.

Mr. STENNIS. It might be helpful, Mr. President, in trying to adjust all of these matters for orderly presentation.

Mr. CANNON. Very well. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the yeas and nays be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I temporarily withdraw my amendment from consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be withdrawn.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nevada.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I propose to offer at this time a unanimous-consent request with reference first to a time limitation on the amendments that I shall specify, then the general amendments that are unnamed, and then with respect to final adoption of the resolution. I have notified all Senators who have amendments that I know about.

I am advised that the minority leader, the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], wishes to be present when the unanimous-consent request is proposed. I understand that he is on his way to the Chamber.

Would the Senator from Pennsylvania rather wait until after the unanimous-consent request has been propounded?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Connecticut wants the Senator from Mississippi to yield to him.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield with the understanding that the Senator will defer when the minority leader comes to the Chamber so that we can get the unanimous-consent agreement attended to.

The unanimous-consent agreement I shall propose would be in effect beginning tomorrow. It would not be in effect this afternoon. We can spend the rest of the afternoon here in general debate.

I know that the Senator from Pennsylvania has a matter that he wants to present to the Senate, as does the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. I do not have anything at the moment. I do not think that I will have anything this afternoon. I have one matter completed and the other is nearly completed.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the minority leader is now present in the Chamber.

I propose to offer a unanimous-consent request. By way of explanation, the request will be a little long. It will apply to some specific amendments.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that beginning tomorrow, in the further consideration of Senate Resolution 266, the amendments be taken up with the following time limitations. I shall not refer to the amendments in the order in which they will be considered. I shall not attempt to control that. I shall just refer to them by number or by subject matter.

The Senator from Pennsylvania has one amendment dealing with the broad subject of disclosure.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. The amendment is jointly sponsored by the Senator from New Jersey, myself, and others. I believe the Senator from Mississippi inadvertently overlooked stating that the time limitation would not start until tomorrow.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. The proposed time limitation would not start until tomorrow.

With respect to the first amendment to proposed rule XLIV of the resolution on disclosure, the unanimous consent request is that debate on the amendment

be limited to 3 hours, one and a half hours to each side, the time to be controlled by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and the committee chairman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator inform the Chair what the number of that amendment is?

Mr. CLARK. No. 623.

Mr. STENNIS. No. 623.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. DODD. Is that 3½ hours on the Clark amendment?

Mr. STENNIS. Three hours on the Clark amendment No. 623.

As a further part of the unanimous-consent request, Mr. President, another amendment on the subject of disclosure may be offered, and on that amendment I request that the time limitation for debate be a total of 1 hour, the time to be equally divided between the Senator from Pennsylvania and the chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPONG in the chair). Will the Senator from Mississippi identify that amendment by number, please?

Mr. CLARK. I regret to state that I do not have that amendment with me. I will be able to identify it as soon as my staff assistant arrives in the Chamber. He is on his way now.

Mr. STENNIS. It is an unnumbered amendment on the subject of disclosure as reflected in rule XLIV.

Mr. President, we will have another amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the number of which is 622. It will relate to the question of additional office expense of a Senator. The Senator from Pennsylvania is the coauthor. The request is that 2 hours be allowed for debate on that amendment, 1 hour to each side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Mississippi state who is to control the time on amendment No. 622, offered by the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. STENNIS. The time is to be controlled by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] and in opposition to the amendment the time is to be controlled by the committee chairman or someone acting for him.

There probably will be an amendment that will pertain to—I do not know who will offer the amendment, but I will describe it by subject matter—proposed rule XLIII and will relate to the matter of a member of the staff being eligible to receive or to solicit funds in connection with a campaign. As a part of this unanimous-consent request, I propose that debate be limited to 2 hours on that amendment, 1 hour to each side, the time to be controlled by the proponent of the amendment and, in opposition, by a Senator acting for the committee.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I have discussed the question of people taken off the payroll during a campaign, with the loss of insurance. I wonder if that is the amendment to which the Senator now refers.

Mr. STENNIS. That is the subject matter of the amendment I was describing

at this time. The request as to that amendment is for a time limitation of 2 hours, 1 hour to each side.

Mr. President, I believe that brings us to the amendment of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I have been informed that an amendment may be offered to the first rule that the committee recommended, dealing with outside employment of office employees. That is a complete rule. It seems to me that there should be 2 hours of debate on that rule.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, as a part of the unanimous-consent request, I ask that any amendment relating to proposed rule XLI, which begins on page 2, lines 6 and 7, by whomever it is offered, be allotted 2 hours of debate, 1 hour to be controlled by the proponent of the amendment, and 1 hour, in opposition, to be controlled by the committee chairman or someone acting on behalf of the committee.

That brings us to the amendment of the Senator from Nevada, which has been discussed.

Does the Senator suggest a time limitation on that amendment?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, as to the amendment I have already discussed, I believe a 30-minute limit would be acceptable, 15 minutes to a side. However, I have another amendment pending at the desk, No. 616, and I believe that might require 1 hour—30 minutes to a side.

Mr. STENNIS. What is the number of the first amendment?

Mr. CANNON. The first one is unnumbered. The one we have discussed is unnumbered. That is the one we discussed this afternoon at some length.

Mr. STENNIS. As to the unnumbered amendment, which was discussed this afternoon and was withdrawn temporarily by the Senator, the request is that there be a time limitation of 1 hour.

Mr. CANNON. Thirty minutes.

Mr. STENNIS. It has been discussed, but not many Senators were present.

As to that amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada, I request 1 hour, 30 minutes to each side, the time to be divided between the proponent and the opponent.

With respect to the amendment of the Senator from Nevada which has not been discussed—

Mr. CANNON. That is No. 616.

Mr. STENNIS. The request as to that amendment is for a time limitation of 1 hour, the time to be equally divided between the proponent and the Senator acting on behalf of the committee.

With respect to other amendments that may be offered, the request is that the time be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between the proponents and those in opposition.

On final passage, the request is that the time for debate be limited to 3 hours, the time to be equally divided between and controlled by the minority leader and a Senator acting on behalf of the committee.

That, Mr. President, completes the unanimous-consent request that would start tomorrow.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. The amendments of the Senator from Connecticut would be included in those that are not numbered.

Mr. DODD. I have two amendments. I believe that I could be very brief with one. I am concerned that the other one might take longer than a half hour. I do not wish to delay the Senate, but I believe the pending resolution is one of the most important questions that has come before the Senate. It has been discussed for 2 or 3 years.

I do not think we should do anything precipitately here. I would like to have the opportunity to explain my amendment. I am not at all sure I can do it in one-half hour. If any other Senator wishes to speak on the subject it could not conceivably be done in that time.

Mr. STENNIS. What time would the Senator suggest?

Mr. DODD. I think it would require a couple of hours.

I do not know why we are placing a time limitation on this matter. This is such an important matter that I believe we should all be heard on the committee's proposals. I believe the country is watching us. There is much to be said that has not been said. I have a very great interest, as all Senators know, and I know that all Senators have an interest also.

However, tomorrow is Wednesday. Why can we not go through these amendments, consider them and debate them, and see if we can reach a time limitation?

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate the suggestion of the Senator from Connecticut. The committee does not wish to unduly limit the time under any circumstances. These were mere suggestions that came as much from the proponents of the amendments as they did from anyone else. We have been here all afternoon—although only some Senators have been present—and I thought we should have some understanding and get matters started on controlled time, so the proceedings would take place in a better manner. There is time on the bill to be allowed. I believe that any Senator should have as much time as he suggests.

Mr. President, I include as a part of my request that there be 1 hour on any side on any amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut, the time to be controlled by the proponent of the amendment and the party in opposition.

Mr. DODD. That is agreeable. However, I am concerned with debate on all amendments. I would not have any trouble presenting my amendment in 1 hour, but I think we should be careful about how we consider all the aspects of this legislation.

I am as anxious as the Senator from Mississippi is to reach a conclusion on this matter. However, I did not get an opportunity to work on the committee resolution until last weekend because it was not distributed to Senators until Friday of last week.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Mississippi is not in a hurry. I have as much time as anyone else, and I am here from

now on, as far as this matter is concerned.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object and maintaining the reservation, let me inquire, Is this a single unanimous-consent request covering all of these items?

Mr. STENNIS. I outlined the whole matter at one time in order to get the entire picture as best I could before the Senate. If the Senator would rather take them up one at a time, that is satisfactory to me.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, first of all, the report of the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct was not laid on the desks of Senators until toward the weekend of last week. We were busy on other matters. There were absentees when we considered the money resolution—a great many of them. I have not had time to properly digest the report.

Second, there is a great divergence between this report and the report of the Ethics Committee in the House of Representatives, which consisted of 12 members, and submitted to their body.

Third, there are other amendments. There are amendments by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], and others that have not been included, except under the general proviso that there be 1 hour.

Fourth, I have an idea that tomorrow I shall have some amendments, too.

This is a most important matter. It had spirited discussion in the minority policy committee meeting this noon. It was truly astonishing how many questions were raised with respect to this rules change.

Under the circumstances, Mr. President, I must object, and I would have to object to any single request on any amendment, simply because it is an important matter and Senators are entitled to digest those things that are going to apply to this body, and in the case of those who at some time may become candidates, and which may not apply to opponents. In the case of those who get opposition from the House of Representatives, they will be operating under one standard, and Senators will be operating under another standard.

Therefore, Mr. President, I object.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have objected.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, my question to the Senator from Illinois is going to be whether he would object to a seriatim time limit on one amendment at a time to see whether we can work out limitations on amendments that have not been submitted or printed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will get to that when they are reported.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may propose an amendment?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

AMENDMENT NO. 623

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I call up the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey and me, which has been printed, and I ask that it be stated by title, but not read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

Beginning with line 15, page 5, strike out all to and including line 4, page 9, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"RULE XLIV

"DISCLOSURE OF FINANCIAL INTERESTS

"1. Each individual who at any time during any calendar year serves as a Member of the Senate, or as an officer or employee of the Senate compensated at a gross rate in excess of \$15,000 per annum, shall file with the Comptroller General for that calendar year a written report containing the following information:

"(a) The fair market value of each asset held by him or by any member of his immediate family or by him and any member of his immediate family jointly, exclusive of any dwelling occupied as a residence by him or by members of his immediate family, at the end of that calendar year;

"(b) The amount of each liability owed by him or by any member of his immediate family, or by him and any member of his immediate family jointly, at the end of that calendar year;

"(c) The source and amount of each capital gain realized, during that calendar year by him or by any member of his immediate family, by him and any member of his immediate family jointly, or by any person acting on behalf of or pursuant to the direction of him or any member of his immediate family, or him and any member of his immediate family jointly, as a result of any transaction or series of related transactions in securities or commodities, or any purchase or sale of real property or any interest therein other than a dwelling occupied as a residence by him or by members of his immediate family;

"(d) The source and amount of each item of income, each item of reimbursement for any expenditure, and each gift or aggregate of gifts from one source (other than gifts received from any relative or any member of his immediate family) received by or accruing to him, any member of his immediate family, or him and any member of his immediate family jointly from any source other than the United States during that calendar year, which exceeds \$100 in amount or value; including any fee or other honorarium received by him or in connection with the preparation or delivery of any speech or address, attendance at any convention or other assembly of individuals, or the preparation of any article or other composition for publication, and the monetary value of subsistence, entertainment, travel, or other facilities received by him in kind;

"(e) The name and address of any professional firm which engages in practice before any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States in which he has a financial interest; and the name, address, and a brief description of the principal business of any client of such firm for whom any services involving representation before any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States were performed during that calendar year, together with a brief description of the services performed, and the total fees received or receivable by the firm as compensation for such services;

"(f) The name, address, and nature of the principal business or activity of each business or financial entity or enterprise with which he was associated at any time during

that calendar year as an officer, director, or partner, or in any other managerial capacity.

"2. Each asset consisting of an interest in a business or financial entity or enterprise which is subject to disclosure under paragraph 1 shall be identified in each report made pursuant to that paragraph by a statement of the name of such entity or enterprise, the location of its principal office, and the nature of the business or activity in which it is principally engaged or with which it is principally concerned, except that an asset which is a security traded on any securities exchange subject to supervision by the Securities and Exchange Commission of the United States may be identified by a full and complete description of the security and the name of the issuer thereof. Each liability which is subject to disclosure under paragraph 1 shall be identified in each report made pursuant to that paragraph by a statement of the name and the address of the creditor to whom the obligation of such liability is owed.

"3. Except as otherwise hereinafter provided, each individual who is required by paragraph 1 to file a report for any calendar year shall file such report with the Comptroller General not later than April 30 of the next following calendar year. No such report shall be required to be made for any calendar year beginning before January 1, 1968. No report made for the calendar year 1968 need include any interest held, payment received, or liability owed before the date which follows by ninety days the adoption of this rule. The requirements of this rule shall apply only with respect to individuals who are Members of the Senate or officers or employees of the Senate on or after the date of adoption of this rule. Any individual who ceases to serve as a Member of the Senate or as an officer or employee of the Senate, before the close of any calendar year shall file such report on the last day of such service, or on such date not more than three months thereafter as the Comptroller General may prescribe, and the report so made shall be made for that portion of that calendar year during which such individual so served. Whenever there is on file with the Comptroller General a report made by any individual in compliance with paragraph 1 for any calendar year, the Comptroller General may accept from that individual for any succeeding calendar year, in lieu of the report required by paragraph 1, a certificate containing an accurate recitation of the changes in such report which are required for compliance with the provisions of paragraph 1 for that succeeding calendar year, or a statement to the effect that no change in such report is required for compliance with the provisions of paragraph 1 for that succeeding calendar year.

"4. Reports and certificates filed under this rule shall be made upon forms which shall be prepared and provided by the Comptroller General, and shall be made in such manner and detail as he shall prescribe. The Comptroller General may provide for the grouping within such reports and certificates of items which are required by paragraph 1 to be disclosed whenever he determines that separate itemization thereof is not feasible or is not required for accurate disclosure with respect to such items. Reports and certificates filed under this rule shall be retained by the Comptroller General as public records for not less than seven years after the close of the calendar year for which they are made, and while so retained shall be available for inspection by members of the public under such reasonable regulations as the Comptroller General shall prescribe.

"5. As used in this rule—

"(a) The term 'asset' includes any beneficial interest held or possessed directly or indirectly in any business or financial entity or enterprise, or in any security or evidence of indebtedness, but does not include any interest in any organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code

of 1954 which is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code;

"(b) The term 'liability' includes any liability of any trust in which a beneficial interest is held or possessed directly or indirectly;

"(c) The term 'income' means gross income as defined by section 61 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

"(d) The term 'security' means any security as defined by section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended (15 U.S.C. 77b);

"(e) The term 'commodity' means any commodity as defined by section 2 of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 2);

"(f) The term 'dealing in securities or commodities' means any acquisition, transfer, disposition, or other transaction involving any security or commodity;

"(g) The term 'officer or employee of the Senate' means (1) an elected officer of the Senate who is not a Member of the Senate, (2) an employee of the Senate or any committee or subcommittee of the Senate, (3) the Legislative Counsel of the Senate and employees of his office, (4) an Official Reporter of Debates of the Senate and any person employed by the Official Reporters of Debates of the Senate in connection with the performance of their official duties, (5) a member of the Capitol Police force whose compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate, (6) an employee of the Vice President if such employee's compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate, (7) an employee of a Member of the Senate, if such employee's compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate, and (8) an employee of a joint committee of the Congress whose compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate; and

"(h) The term 'immediate family', when used with respect to any person, includes the spouse and each minor child of such person."

Beginning with line 23, page 4, strike out all to and including line 26, page 4.

On page 5, line 1, strike out "4", and insert in lieu thereof "3".

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have asked that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with by unanimous consent so that I may explain it.

Now, I wish to say to my friend from Illinois that this amendment has been printed and we now have on the desk of every Senator a simple explanation of it.

The suggestion of the Senator from Mississippi was that we debate the amendment for the remainder of the afternoon, and then come in tomorrow and discuss it for 3 hours, an hour and a half on each side.

I wonder if my good, gracious, and congenial friend would agree that that would be adequate time for serious discussion.

Mr. DIRKSEN. They have just handed me the explanation. The amendment is printed.

Mr. CLARK. I beg the Senator's pardon. The amendment is printed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I said the amendment is printed. They just handed me a mimeographed explanation. I have not seen it before. I do not propose to permit a time limitation until other Senators have had an opportunity to read it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I wonder if the Senator, with the benefit of further cogitation and a good night's sleep, might be more receptive tomorrow to a suggestion that we limit the time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We will let tomorrow take care of itself.

Mr. CLARK. We will let it creep at its petty pace.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I think that any Senator is entirely within his rights in objecting to this unanimous-consent request or any request, as far as the committee is concerned. We wanted to get before the Senate the list of amendments we knew about and determine if we could get started on some matters.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, first, I should like to say that I listened with interest to the discussion by the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] of his amendment to make the disclosures and restrictions, which by the rules advocated by the Committee on Standards and Conduct would apply to all Senators, apply also to candidates. I had been dubious as to whether that could be done legally. But the Senator from Nevada has persuaded me that under the provision of the Constitution which makes the Senate the judge of the qualifications of its Members, it is perfectly feasible to provide that any individual who is running for nomination or election to the Senate shall be bound by the same rules as are persons who are actually Senators. If the individual loses his race, nothing will happen. If he wins, and the question of his qualifications is raised, it would then be entirely appropriate for the Senate to submit the successful candidate, when he presented himself for swearing in, to inquiry as to whether he had, in fact, complied with the rules of the body to which he was seeking admission in connection with his primary or his general election campaign.

So I would hope that the members of the Committee on Standards and Conduct, presided over by the able and distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], would give careful thought overnight as to whether the amendment of the Senator from Nevada does not have great merit, and whether the committee would not be willing to accept it as a measure which, I think, can be included among the proposals which they have brought in, and at the same time be entirely fair by putting all candidates for nomination and election, whether Members of the Senate or not, on an equal basis.

With respect to the pending amendment, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS] be listed as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, for the benefit of Senators who will be reading the Record tomorrow, the amendment, which I shall describe in a moment, is very similar indeed to the amendment rejected by a vote of 46 to 42 at the time the election reform bill was under consideration on September 12, 1967. Since this amendment is so similar to that amendment, it may well be that a number of Senators who supported the amendment in 1967 will want to cosponsor the pending amendment. This can readily be done if they will advise the

Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] or me, so that we may make the appropriate motion when the Senate convenes tomorrow.

Amendment No. 623 to Senate Resolution 266 presently cosponsored by Senators CASE, HATFIELD, MORSE, and SPONG would do the following:

It would provide for mandatory public financial disclosure for all Senators and Senate employees with an annual salary of \$15,000 or more, as opposed to the confidential disclosure with the Comptroller General which is proposed in Senate Resolution 266 as a part of the proposed new Senate rule XLIV.

Under the proposed amendment, disclosure would still be made to the Comptroller General, who would retain the reports filed with him for not less than 7 years. This is the same proposal contained in the committee resolution. I think the 7-year term is excellent. It would cover two separate elections to the Senate. That is plenty long enough but not too long. We would support that.

The amendment would provide that the documents constituting the disclosure would be made available for inspection by members of the public under appropriate regulations which would be promulgated by the Comptroller General. The reports to be filed would contain the following information which, in the opinion of the sponsors of the amendment, is adequate to provide a searching and complete disclosure but does not require the filing of Federal income tax returns which, almost necessarily, contain a good deal of information which, in my opinion, is not necessary to have disclosed in order to protect the public from any possible conflict of interest or improper financial action by a Senator.

The information to be disclosed can be summarized under six headings, as follows:

First. Fair market value of each asset, excluding family residences;

Second. Amount and identity of each liability;

Third. Source and amount of each capital gain;

Fourth. Source and amount of each item of income, and each gift—other than gifts from relatives—over \$100.

I ask all Senators who have the explanation of the amendment on their desks, to note a typographical error in item 4, next to the last words, "under \$100," which should be "over \$100."

Fifth. Association with a professional firm, identity of any client represented by the firm before a U.S. agency, description of services performed, and fees received;

Sixth. Association with business enterprise as an officer, director, partner, or manager.

Spouses—or, as my friend from Rhode Island prefers to call them, "spice"—and minor children would be covered, and transactions through a strawman would have to be disclosed. The rule would take effect 90 days after adoption by the Senate.

I point out that trusts are also covered with particular reference to the interest, what is known in the law as a *cuius* trust on those who hold the beneficial

interest. The term "asset" includes any beneficial interest held or possessed directly or indirectly in any business or financial entity or enterprise, or in any security or evidence of indebtedness, but does not include any interest in charitable organizations which are exempt from taxation under the revenue code. The same situation applies with respect to the definition of "liabilities."

I point out that this is substantially the same amendment which was defeated by a vote of 42 to 46 on September 12, 1967, when it was offered to the election reform bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator refers to "fair market value of each asset, excluding family residences." Some people have a home in the home State, and one in Washington here. What about it?

Mr. CLARK. The provision is for dwellings occupied as a residence by him or members of his immediate family.

Mr. ANDERSON. I have a house in New Mexico. I have a house here.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator would not have to reveal either of them.

Mr. ANDERSON. I want to ask for my information, as to item 3, "source and amount of each capital gain," is capital gain closely defined in the internal revenue regulations?

Mr. CLARK. It is identical.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think it is. Does that eliminate, then, the smaller short-term gains?

Mr. CLARK. The term "capital gain" is used in the sense that it is used in the Internal Revenue Code.

Mr. ANDERSON. Then, it would not be a short-term gain or loss?

Mr. CLARK. I believe the reference to the Internal Revenue Code may be misleading. Let me read the language from my amendment to the Senator. It is on page 2, beginning on line 12 of the amendment:

The source and amount of each capital gain realized, during that calendar year by him or by any member of his immediate family, by him and any member of his immediate family, jointly, or by any person acting on behalf of or pursuant to the direction of him or any member of his immediate family, or him and any member of his immediate family jointly, as a result of any transaction or series of transactions in securities or commodities, or any purchase or sale of real property or any interest therein other than a dwelling occupied as a residence by him or by members of his immediate family.

Therefore, I think clearly it would apply to both long-term and short-term capital gains.

Of course, the purpose of disclosure is to show how the Senator makes his money. Since the term "income," under the Internal Revenue Code, is usually not considered as including capital gains, it was decided to use that term in a separate disclosure section in the amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. The fifth item provides for the disclosure of any professional firm which engages in practice before a U.S. agency, together with a brief description of the services performed and the total fees received.

I pay a little money to a financial advisory group in New York. Does that put it under the definition of "professional firm"?

Mr. CLARK. Well, I myself pay a little money, not only to an investment firm in New York, but also to an oil and gas advisory group in Louisiana. I think the best way to answer the Senator's question is to read the text of the amendment as it appears on page 3, beginning on line 13:

The name and address of any professional firm which engages in practice before any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States in which he has a financial interest.

Since the kind of relationship which the Senator from New Mexico mentioned, and which I indicated I, too, participated in, is not a financial interest in such a firm, it would not be disclosed.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am happy to have that explanation of it. I thought that is what it would be, but I would not want a firm in New York to have to explain my affairs. It probably is the same as the Senator from Pennsylvania's.

Mr. CLARK. I do not know. My son is in the one I use. I do not know whether the Senator from New Mexico uses that one or not.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. BURDICK. I was one who supported the Senator in 1967. I did it with some reluctance, because of one feature of the bill. I notice this measure now applies to members of the immediate family, which includes spouses and also children under 21.

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. BURDICK. Would this apply to a spouse who had an estate before the Senator had married the spouse?

Mr. CLARK. I am afraid it would. It seems to me, on the whole, the provision is desirable, because the purpose is to reveal the potential financial interest of a Senator and his immediate family. The fact that his spouse had acquired the funds before the marriage would have very little bearing on the extent to which, in the normal marriage, her assets would be available, in part at least, for her husband's political activity.

Mr. BURDICK. Let us assume the spouse had been a widow, and the widow had children, and the former husband had set up trusts for the minor children. Would the minor children have to disclose that?

Mr. CLARK. I would not think so, because the minor children were not the Senator's children.

Mr. BURDICK. Once they were adopted, they would be.

Mr. CLARK. I am afraid if the Senator went ahead and adopted them, he would be "stuck."

Mr. BURDICK. Does not the Senator think that is going a little far into the private lives of families?

Mr. CLARK. I am susceptible to that argument. If the Senator would prepare an amendment which would exclude that rather peculiar and extremely limited category, I would look at it with some sympathy. I would, of course, want to

discuss it with my friend from New Jersey and other Senators. It may well be that, as this debate proceeds, we will find some situations in which we think the provisions of this amendment are too strict.

Mr. BURDICK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield the floor, unless other Senators have questions.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am glad the Senator gave that last statement. If someone had inherited property, we would not want to go back to the trust which had been set up. I am glad the Senator from North Dakota asked that question.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Mississippi indicated that he would be favorable to proceeding to a discussion and consideration of this amendment. This gives us time to have a discussion. I am sure the Senator from New Jersey and I do not intend to be arbitrary about this. As each suggestion comes from our colleagues, we can tell whether the disclosure is in the national interest or the interest of the Senate. The Senator from New Jersey has already indicated he is favorable to an amendment which the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] would like to have us consider.

Mr. ANDERSON. Sometimes the wife does not disclose to her husband her own financial situation.

Mr. CLARK. And vice versa.

Mr. ANDERSON. No; it cannot be done that way in my State.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. PEARSON. The proposed code, although it is part of the closed financial disclosure, deals with trusts, and I am wondering whether the Senator's amendment would likewise deal with trusts.

Mr. CLARK. Yes; and beneficial interest therein. I do not think there is any significant difference in the disclosure features of the pending amendment with reference to trusts and the amendment supported by the Ethics Committee. There are two differences. First, this amendment calls for complete public disclosure; and, second, instead of using the Federal income tax as the base, we have attempted to spell out the various categories of financial interest which we thought were desirable to incorporate in the disclosure proposal.

Mr. PEARSON. I thank the Senator.

I make a further inquiry, almost in the form of an observation. Within the committee deliberations, time and time again I came to the conclusion that perhaps open and complete disclosure might be a good thing. I came to that conclusion not because of the need for public confidence to be engendered as because it was so difficult to write any sort of disclosure code and rule.

In that regard, I held the view—and I will ask the Senator to comment on it—a number of times that public disclosure might very well take the form, not so much of identity and the amount, but identity itself. I am not seeking to draw

a line as to where a man becomes honest or dishonest, but a disclosure of the type of property and assets and interest any person might hold, without the amount involved, and also a description of the type of indebtedness a person might owe, without the amount involved.

The point is that perhaps the public would have the right to know what assets, what property, one may hold and what his indebtedness is, but without knowing the amounts involved.

Mr. CLARK. I would observe, with all respect to my friend, the Senator from Kansas, that I do not think that would be adequate. Let me give the Senator an example, I personally happen to hold an interest in minerals, oil and gas, from which I get a fairly significant royalty each month. In fact, it is the principal source of my unearned income. I disclose that every year, anyway. I also own a few shares of stock in a well-known life insurance company. The return from one is many, many times the return from the other.

I would think that I ought to alert my constituents to the amounts of the principal sources of my income, so that there would be no misunderstanding as to what areas of possible conflict might arise. Somewhat nostalgically—I guess nostalgically is not the right word, but I think perhaps somewhat cynically, during my service over the years I have voted in favor of reducing the oil depletion allowance, knowing reasonably well that my vote would not prevail, and happily taking the depletion allowance whenever I filed my income tax returns. The time has come when I shall regret that quixotism.

Mr. CASE. The Senator is not fair to himself. I cannot permit him to describe his motives in that fashion.

But I do think there is a point here, if the Senator will yield so that I may comment.

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield. I will yield the floor, if the Senator wishes.

Mr. CASE. No, no. The Senator from Delaware, as I believe the Senator from Pennsylvania mentioned, has raised with us the question of whether, in the case of real estate, a description of the property and perhaps a statement of its assessed value might not substantially meet the situation that we have in mind. The Senator from Pennsylvania and I have discussed that proposition, and have at least tentatively agreed to consider it further.

I do think there are occasions when the size of a person's obligation or the amount of the value of particular assets is a relevant part of the description of those assets and would be of interest from the standpoint of what we are trying to get at, which is the existence or possible existence of conflicts of interest.

Mr. CLARK. I agree.

Mr. CASE. And that is the only reason, in matters of this kind. I think in the case of a tangible piece of property, if that is a proper word to use for real estate, to look at the property itself, its size, description, and so forth, may be adequate.

Mr. CLARK. Yes. If we know where it is, we can go out and look at it or send someone out to look at it.

Mr. CASE. It is not our intention to harass or hurt or embarrass people by requiring them to make statements which might be used against them by tax assessors and others in the future.

Mr. CLARK. Nobody wants to let anybody else into his safe deposit box to examine his securities. But I should think, if it were revealed that a piece of timberland located in such and such a township, having an assessed value of x dollars, is owned by the Senator, that would probably be enough.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Why does the administration of this law require a different standard for the Senator than for the ordinary citizen?

As in the case of any citizen, if we are interested in how much his income is, if anybody has any questions, the Senate Finance Committee can get a copy of his tax return. Why do we have to have more than that here?

Mr. CLARK. In the first place, the tax return is not made public. That is probably the biggest reason. In the second place, I think the Senator from New Mexico, with his wide and deep business experience, would agree with me that capital gains are among the most helpful types of income, and are frequently realized and actually treated, in many instances, as though they were income.

Mr. ANDERSON. It is not improper to have income. Why should we single out a single person or a single group, and say that each must reveal it? A businessman does not have to make public his income.

Mr. CLARK. This is the argument made by the distinguished minority leader, who says that disclosure would make of him a second-class citizen. I do not agree with that. It seems to me that anyone who determines to seek election as a Member of the United States Senate owes to his constituents that same high standard which traditionally has been said to have been required by Caesar's wife, that she should be above suspicion.

Mr. ANDERSON. Above reproach.

Mr. CLARK. We have had too many instances in the history of the Senate, going back over the years, where there was evidence of dealing under the table by Senators who were subjected to and yielded to improper influences, to make me feel that anything less than a rather rigorous and complete financial disclosure—such as many of us have made over the years—is insufficient.

Mr. ANDERSON. We have made it, that is right, and we have all filed these statements right along; but it is not advertised as being income that someone might object to.

I simply do not see why income has to be specially classified here, when we have many other reporting services that do not check it that way.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from Pennsylvania—I understand the Senator has another amendment on the same subject. Did the Senator wish to present that

amendment now? I am not trying to press him; he has been very cooperative.

Mr. CLARK. Yes; I would be prepared now, without offering it, to have it identified by number. It is amendment No. 629, which has been filed at the desk and will be printed overnight.

It is what might be called a fall-back amendment, in the event the pending amendment is defeated. It would, in general, return to the language of the committee proposals with respect to disclosures, but substitute, very simply, public disclosure for private disclosure.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

If I may summarize briefly, Mr. President, in behalf of the committee, we certainly considered all the major points, at least, of the amendment which has just been presented to the Senate and discussed by the Senator from Pennsylvania. We weighed the merits of each of those points as against the merits of the provisions that we adopted.

Our main controlling thought was that there had to be some recognition of the privacy and the rights of privacy, to the degree that an individual still possesses such rights when he comes into the Senate. Even though he is a public servant, the committee felt he just should not be literally stripped in public, if I may use that term; but at the same time we strongly favored the idea of some regulation and some disclosure to the Senate and then, through the Senate, in cases that we felt should be disclosed to the public, public disclosure.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I think the simplest statement of the contrary view to what the Senator from Mississippi has just said appears in the supplemental views of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] to the report of the committee, in which he states:

I disagree with the action of the committee on proposed rule XLIV relating to disclosure of financial interests. The reasons for and against public disclosure have been examined and debated by the Senate on many occasions and I will not elaborate them in this statement. It has been and is now my position that disclosure of financial interests should be available to the public and I shall support and vote for such a measure.

I myself have, on a number of occasions since coming to the Senate, raised the same point, usually unsuccessfully. As a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration, I tried, with the support, as I recall it, of the Senator from Kentucky, to provide for public disclosure. I felt that this became a matter of acute importance, involving the integrity of the Senate, at the time of the Bobby Baker disclosures. I felt then that, had there been an adequate public disclosure of the financial activities of Senators and well-paid members of their staffs, we might have avoided the unfortunate publicity and unfortunate public reaction to the standards on conduct of the Senate which followed.

I thank the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I commented yesterday on my views with respect to this rule, and the Senator from Pennsylvania has correctly stated my position.

I filed and there appears in the report of the committee my supplemental views on two issues on which I disagree with the majority of the committee.

I also serve on the Rules and Administration Committee, in which we have had numerous debates and discussions on the subject of disclosure. For 2 years, the select committee has considered the disclosure rule and other rules which are now recommended to the Senate. As the Senator from Mississippi has said, our report is a first step in the field of ethics and upon which the Senate must now act.

The disclosure rule has been a very difficult question, for it involves issues which can be argued with strength on either side.

On one side, there is the interest of protecting as far as possible privacy. However, I came to the conclusion several years ago that our official work is affected by the public interest. Upon that basis I argued the case in committee, and I have submitted my views in the report, by which I stand. I support the amendment offered by the distinguished Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and from New Jersey [Mr. CASE].

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, there was a Member of the Senate many years ago from Michigan. He was a multimillionaire. I do not think that anyone ever criticized his conduct as a Member of the Senate. He had owned a good portion of the Ford Motor Co. He was a very distinguished Member of the Senate.

Sometimes these reports are not too revealing. I felt one day that I had to make a financial report. I had loaned some money to a man who owned a radio station who was in some financial distress. He was a friend of mine, and I supplied some money by purchasing stock. As a result, I had to fill out a financial statement. I listed in the report everything that I possessed or could hope to possess.

A very well-to-do Senator from the State of Oklahoma had to make the same kind of report. He said, "Worth more than \$10,000." That statement was satisfactory.

I think that if one person has to itemize all of his holdings, all others should do so, too, and he should list all property and all other possessions.

Under the pending measure, everybody who owned anything of the value of \$10,000 or more would have to report it. If anyone had bought a share of stock years ago, he would have to report that and would have to report the capital gains and capital losses.

I think it is a waste of time. I hope the matter is rejected.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator very much for his contribution to the debate. His comments are all very worthy.

Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania, with his great sincerity, can be answered, I think, by stating that before a man ever gets to the Senate he is passed upon by the electorate of his State which always includes a great many people of discriminating thought, intuition, and evaluation. The battle is fought out on the firing line and between the parties. The people of the State pass upon the facts and they pass upon the man. The people judge all the facts relating to the man and the problems he will face.

There is a refining and filling-out process that has been going on in our country for almost 200 years. That has been a major part of the committee's thinking on disclosure.

A candidate is examined, exposed, and picked to pieces to a considerable extent. Many of the people know the man personally, where he was reared, what his habits are, what property he holds, and what his faults are.

The people pass on all of those factors. They pass upon the man, his moral character, and fiber. They know what he will do under pressure. They know what he will do under coercion. They know what he will do under political persuasion. The people have a good idea as to that when they deliberately select him to represent them in the Senate.

It seems to me that before the man gets here, if we are to assume that he is unworthy, that he cannot be trusted fully, or that the man is going to be wrong in his approach to problems or wrong in his contacts, and we say to him: "No; we will not let you be a Member of the Senate; we will not let you take your oath and do what you have been selected to do until we strip you in public, so to speak, and expose everything in the world about you," I do not think such action is in keeping with the tradition of the Senate.

And when we adopt that rule, if we ever do, then I think something big and fine will have gone out of this body, and the Senate will become more ordinary than it should be.

We should appeal to the very best that there is in a man. I think that any other approach would have a degrading effect on the man and on this institution. I think it would express a distrust of the people themselves. We did not agree to do that. However, we did adopt the best

rule we could, a rule that would protect that man in such privacy as we thought he was entitled to and at the same time require him to make a report readily acceptable to the Senate at all times, filed in advance, some of it under oath, including the income tax returns. That is there as a protection and a safeguard to him. However, at the same time, we have the written record, so if there are any allegations as to irregularities or even a strong suspicion of wrongful conduct that might be deemed worthy of investigation, the Senate itself, through its processes, could look into that record, made perhaps 2 or 3 years earlier. But it would be in writing. It might contain certain supplemental matters. The facts, or the substance of the facts, would be available and could be checked into. However, they would not be used, would not be exposed, or would not be given out against him until he had had a chance to be heard and to refute the facts in closed session. That is the American system. That is the protection that we afford.

If wrongdoing were shown, it would be exposed, of course, according to the general methods that constitute due process of law under our system—a chance to be heard and an opportunity to call witnesses.

That is the case. But on top of all that, we extracted all those financial items that go with public life, go with official conduct or official expenditures or semi-official expenditures, such as the cost of campaigns, the cost of dealing with constituents in a semiofficial capacity, and said that that information must be published every year. In that way, only the items that are private, that are not fully disclosed, are fixed where they can be readily disclosed for cause.

The committee believes that that is the soundest rule, that it is the American rule. I believe that on a test of the amendment, the selection we have made will prove to be the will of the Senate.

Mr. President, I am ready to yield the floor. The Senate will not have any votes this afternoon. As a practical matter, I know it will not. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask

unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from Mississippi for waiting for me. I was delayed.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 635 AND 636

Mr. President, I send to the desk two amendments, and I ask that they be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. STENNIS. Another amendment is pending. Does the Senator wish to have these amendments read?

Mr. DODD. I do not insist on their being read. If they are printed, they will be available in the morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator requests that the amendments be printed.

What is the will of the Senate?

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock meridian tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock meridian tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 20, 1968, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate March 19, 1968:

IN THE AIR FORCE

Lt. Gen. Jack G. Merrell, FR1687 (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President in the grade of general, under the provisions of section 6066, title 10 of the United States Code.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, March 19, 1968

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Wilbur N. Daniel, Antioch Missionary Baptist Church, Chicago, Ill., offered the following prayer:

In all thy ways acknowledge Him, and He shall direct thy paths.—Proverbs 3: 6.

Almighty and allwise God, Thou who hath revealed Thyself as a strength to sustain us and a light to lead us, may this day be rich in the realization of Thy nearness.

Give us the faith to believe that it is possible for us to live victoriously even in the midst of dangerous opportunity that we call crisis.

Grant to us a faith which will make us victorious over all the dark and disquieting moods which so frequently beset and baffle us.

Help us to interpret our longings and labors for universal peace; not as an idle dream, but as a glorious divine inspiration from Thee.

We pray that Thou wilt teach us and show us how we may bring about a closer fellowship and a better understanding between all members of the human family. O God, may we see and understand just how much we have in common and how much we need each

other. May we be guided by Thy will as we work together and minister to one another's welfare, peace, and happiness.

Hear us, O God, in the name of the Captain of our Salvation. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE REVEREND WILBUR N. DANIEL

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to pay my respects to one of the outstanding clergymen of America. Today we have the Reverend Wilbur N. Daniel, of the Antioch Missionary Baptist Church of Chicago, Ill., to give the invocation. He is the spiritual leader of a congregation made up of over 4,000 people which necessitates the services of over 17 assistants to aid him in administering the spiritual needs of his people.

Reverend Daniel is one of the outstanding men in Chicago in the civic and community life as well as the spiritual. He has been very active fighting for better housing and especially for the housing for the aged. At the present time, he is the director of a \$13 million housing project.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that it has been a great pleasure to have a man of this character give the prayer today, and I want to join my colleagues in extending our thanks and appreciation for his participation in the session today.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE NOBLE J. JOHNSON

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS].

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, it is with sad notice that I join my colleagues today in paying tribute to the late Representative, Noble J. Johnson, of Indiana. Many of you will remember Congressman Johnson who last served in the House as a Member of the 80th Congress.

As a young man I was a constituent of Mr. Johnson. Later, I had the honor of counting Congressman Johnson, his wife Mercy, and daughter Miriam among my Seventh District constituents. In fact, he accompanied me to the floor of the House last January when I was sworn in. Those of us who knew Congressman Johnson had come to recognize and respect his dedication to public service and sincere friendship.

First elected to the 69th Congress in 1924, Congressman Johnson served eight terms from the old Fifth and Sixth Congressional Districts of Indiana. In 1948, President Truman appointed him judge of the U.S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals. President Eisenhower elevated him to chief judge of that court in 1956.

Our colleague was a fine gentleman and Representative of the Hoosier State he loved so dearly. He will be remembered for his many constructive contributions during more than 40 years of service to his community, State, and Nation. Mrs. Myers and I extend to Mrs. Johnson and family our deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MYERS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUDEBUSH].

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, the State of Indiana, the Republican Party,

and the people of the United States have suffered a great loss.

A former Member of this body and one of the most active public officials our State has ever known has died.

The Honorable Noble Jacob Johnson, who emerged from Indiana's Wabash Valley to become one of the country's most noted statesmen, passed away last weekend.

Noble was more than just a Congressman; to the people of western Indiana he was the Government. When they needed him he was there and he gave far more than was asked of him.

Noble was a way of life. He served in the 69th, 70th, and 71st Congresses. He was defeated for a seat in the 72d Congress and suffered another defeat for a spot in the 75th Congress.

But Noble came back. And he came back strong. He was elected to the 76th, 77th, 78th, 79th, and 80th Congresses.

Noble was born in Terre Haute, Ind., on August 23, 1887. He attended grade and high schools in Terre Haute and later studied law.

He was deputy prosecutor for the 43d Judicial Circuit of Indiana in 1917 and 1918. He was elected prosecuting attorney for the circuit and served from 1921 to 1925.

In 1925 he began his career in Congress. He served from 1925 to 1931 and from 1939 to 1948. In 1948 he resigned to become judge of the U.S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

With the passing of Noble Johnson I have lost a dear friend and a person who has helped me throughout the years. But most important, he was a friend to all of us. He made many visits with several of us during the last few years and we have always found him to have wise advice and helpful suggestions.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that many of my colleagues here today share with me the sadness that is in my heart due to the passing of this great man.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MYERS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join my colleagues in expressing sympathy to the family of Noble Johnson. He was a dedicated public servant who served his State and his Nation in a variety of capacities and always with distinction. It can truly be said that he was an outstanding public servant of his beloved country.

Mrs. Adair joins me in extending sympathy to the family.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, all who knew him were saddened by the recent death of the Honorable Noble J. Johnson, retired chief judge of the U.S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

In his long and distinguished career, Judge Johnson served two terms as prosecuting attorney of the 43d Indiana judicial circuit, and was elected as a Representative in the U.S. Congress for eight terms, from the 69th through the 80th Congress.

He resigned from the 80th Congress to become a judge on the court in 1948, and was elevated to chief judge in 1956, by President Eisenhower. Retiring from the

court in 1956, he had resided in Washington, D.C., until his death.

He was one of the Hoosier State's great statesmen and jurists, and Indiana is proud to have contributed so noble a son to the service of his country.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I, too, was saddened to learn of the passing of my former colleague and fellow Hoosier, Noble J. Johnson.

He came to the Congress a decade before I did, and then, after an absence of 8 years, returned to our ranks on this side of the aisle.

Needless to say, we in the minority welcomed him as a legislator of experience and knowhow.

It was my privilege to serve with this distinguished son of Indiana through five terms, during which I came to appreciate Noble Johnson as a conscientious, hardworking Member of this body.

In recognition of his earlier judicial background and his fine record in the Congress, Noble Johnson was appointed to the U.S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals upon his resignation from the Congress. A further mark of recognition of his substantial talents was his elevation to chief judge of the court.

To me, Noble Johnson was a considerate, helpful friend, as I hope I was to him.

He was, in all respects, a "gentleman from Indiana" and I offer my most sincere sympathies to Mrs. Johnson and the family.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks on the life, character, and service of Judge Johnson at the conclusion of my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

AUSTERITY IN THE GREAT SOCIETY

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we heard the President use a new word in the lexicon of his Great Society—"austerity." He said we had to tighten our belts, make sacrifices, and adopt a sound fiscal policy.

It would be heartening if we could believe the President is seriously considering a sizable cutback of Federal expenditures. Unfortunately, behind L. B. J.'s ringing words and the Churchillian mood lies the Great Society spending machine.

As long as there are millions for planting posies along the highways and thousands for studying the social life of the blackbird—and as long as the poverty war keeps padding its payroll while pro-

viding less real help for the poor—I say the budget is overstuffed.

The President talks of cutting \$3 to \$4 billion off his budget, making it appear that this is a major sacrifice—roughly equivalent to losing an arm or a leg, but \$4 billion off \$186 billion is a mere drop in the bucket.

L. B. J.'s oratory in his state of austerity address provides good newspaper copy, but actions speak louder than words and up to this point the President has asked that all the sacrifices be made by the people instead of taking a leading role himself in trimming the sails of his Great Society programs.

RIGHT OF AMERICAN CITIZEN TO OWN AND HOLD GOLD

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, it is time to take a second step so far as gold is concerned and give the American citizen the right to own and hold gold.

The American citizen is the only person in the world outside of the Soviet Union who is denied the right to buy, hold, or sell gold at will.

The first step in this direction was taken Sunday by representatives of the international gold pool when they freed gold commercially to seek its price level on the gold market of the world. Citizens of every other country in the free world are buying gold on the open market. The only citizens in the United States permitted to buy gold are those holding a commercial license to purchase, such as jewelers, dentists, and other gold manufacturers. But so far as the American citizen is concerned, he is still held in the same category as a citizen of the Soviet Union.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the time has come to give the American citizen the right to buy, hold, or sell gold on an American market the same as the other markets of the free world.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

VISITACION ENRIQUEZ MAYPA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4386) for the relief of Visitacion Enriquez Maypa.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

ARTHUR JEROME OLINGER, A MINOR

The Clerk called the bill (S. 155) for the relief of Arthur Jerome Olinger, a minor,

by his next friend, his father, George Henry Olinger, and George Henry Olinger, individually.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

CHESTER E. DAVIS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 233) for the relief of Chester E. Davis.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

JOHN W. ROGERS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1580) for the relief of John W. Rogers.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

DWAYNE C. COX AND WILLIAM D. MARTIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2281) for the relief of Dwayne C. Cox and William D. Martin.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

E. L. TOWNLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11381) for the relief of E. L. Townley.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

JOSEPH M. HEPWORTH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 12119) for the relief of Joseph M. Hepworth.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

ROCHESTER IRON & METAL CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7210) for the relief of the Rochester Iron & Metal Co.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS and Mr. HALL objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recom-

mitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

JE-IL BRICK CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4058) for the relief of the JE-IL Brick Co.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

CHARLES BERNSTEIN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 321) for the relief of Charles Bernstein.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS and Mr. HALL objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommended to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1040) for the relief of certain employees of the Department of the Navy.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

JOSEPH W. HARRIS

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 991) to refer the bill (H.R. 14109) entitled "A bill for the relief of Joseph W. Harris," to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, as amended.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE NAVAL WEAPONS CENTER, CONCORD, CALIF.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2282) for the relief of certain employees of the Naval Weapons Center, Concord, Calif.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

INDIVIDUALS EMPLOYED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY AT FORT SAM HOUSTON, TEX.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10327) for the relief of Louis J. Falardeau, Irva G. Franger, Betty Klemcke, Wineta L. Welburn, and Emma L. McNeil, all individuals employed by the Department of the Army at Fort Sam Houston, Tex.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

PEDRO ANTONIO JULIO SANCHEZ

The Clerk called the bill (S. 126) for the relief of Pedro Antonio Julio Sanchez.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

KELLEY MICHELLE AUERBACH

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2318) for the relief of Kelley Michelle Auerbach.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 2318

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Kelley Michelle Auerbach may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the said Act, upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf by Mrs. Kay J. Auerbach, a citizen of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the said Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAUL L. MARGARET, AND JOSEPHINE KIRSTEATTER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 909) for the relief of Paul L., Margaret, and Josephine Kirsteatter.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

JOHN ALLUNARIO

The Clerk called the bill (L.R. 12073), for the relief of John Allunario.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 12073

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John Allunario, Bloomington, New Jersey, a sum which shall be certified to the Secretary by the Postmaster General as sufficient to cover the payment, at the rate of compensation then applicable, to the said John Allunario for thirty-eight hours of annual leave credit for the leave years 1964 and 1965 which he did not receive because of administrative error and which was subsequently forfeited by law. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by

any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 9, strike "thirty-eight" and insert "fifty-nine".

On page 1, line 10, strike "1964 and 1965" and insert "1962 and 1963".

On page 2, lines 1 and 2, strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

SUBSTITUTE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASHMORE

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a substitute committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute committee amendment offered by Mr. ASHMORE: Strike all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That, in the administration of the annual leave account of John Allunario, a postal employee of Bloomington, New Jersey, there shall be added a separate account of fifty-nine hours of annual leave, in full settlement of all claims of the said John Allunario against the United States for compensation for the loss of such leave which was earned by him in the period January 1, 1962 through December 31, 1963, inclusive, while he was employed by the United States Post Office Department, and which, through administrative error, was not credited to his leave account.

"Sec. 2. Section 203(c) of the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, as amended (65 Stat. 680, 67 Stat. 137; 5 U.S.C. 2062(c)), shall not apply with respect to the leave granted by this Act, and such leave likewise shall not affect the use or accumulation, pursuant to applicable law, of other annual leave earned by the said John Allunario. None of the leave granted by this Act shall be settled by means of a cash payment in the event such leave or part thereof remains unused at the time the said John Allunario is separated by death or otherwise from the Federal service."

The substitute committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 58]

Ashley	Hagan	Roybal
Baring	Halleck	St. Onge
Blackburn	Holland	Selden
Boggs	King, Calif.	Shriver
Burton, Utah	Landrum	Skubitz
Conyers	McEwen	Stubblefield
Cowger	Miller, Calif.	Teague, Calif.
Davis, Ga.	Moorhead	Teague, Tex.
Dent	Mosher	Tuck
Derwinski	Purcell	Tunney
Diggs	Resnick	Watts
Edwards, Calif.	Roth	Wylie

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 397 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 15224, COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 1095) providing for consideration of H.R. 15224, to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1095

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 15224) to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1095 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 15224 to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard.

H.R. 15224 authorizes an appropriation of \$136 million. Of the total authorization, \$67,904,000 is for procurement, extension of service life, and increasing capability of vessels. The sum of \$14,636,000 is authorized for procurement of nine medium-range helicopters.

For establishment or development of installations and facilities by acquisition, construction, conversion, extension, or installation of permanent or temporary public works, including the preparation of sites and furnishing of appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, \$47,660,000 is authorized.

Funds are authorized in the amount of \$5,800,000 for payment to bridge owners for the cost of alteration of railroad and public highway bridges to permit free navigation of the navigable waters of the United States.

Expenditures for the rental of such housing facilities as may be necessary, where there is a lack of adequate housing facilities at or near a Coast Guard installation, may not exceed the average authorized for the Department of Defense.

The duties of the Coast Guard are ever broadening. They have done a magnificent job for us here and are presently rendering a great service in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 1095 in order that H.R. 15224 may be considered.

Mr. QUILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

As the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] has stated, House Resolution 1095 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for the consideration of H.R. 15224, Coast Guard authorization.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1969 for the Coast Guard's needs in ships, planes, and shore facilities.

The bill as introduced called for authorizations totaling \$107,000,000, with only one high-endurance cutter included. The committee believes that two more should be constructed in fiscal year 1969, as 23 of the Coast Guard's 33 cutters are seriously over-aged.

The bill also provides for an oceanographic cutter for scientific research, a coastal buoy tender for use in Chesapeake Bay, nine medium-range recovery aircraft, and improvements at numerous shore facilities, including such items as operational buildings, piers, moorings, and family quarters.

The total authorizations contained in the bill are \$136,000,000, of which \$67,904,000 is for vessel procurement, \$14,636,000 for aircraft, and \$47,660,000 for shore facility construction.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the resolution be adopted, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution. The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE A PRIVILEGED REPORT

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight to file a privileged report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill—H.R. 15224—to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Maryland.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole

House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 15224, with Mr. GILBERT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ], will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. MAILLIARD], will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, every citizen of the United States should be aware of the valuable service rendered by the Coast Guard. There are few people in the country that have not been benefited by its service at some time during the years.

Its helicopters and men are present at disasters and floods throughout the country. It is participating in the war in Vietnam. It renders valuable but unseen service to our Atlantic and Pacific air travelers. It maintains an ice patrol to protect our shipping against another disaster such as the one which befell the *Titanic*, and most importantly, it safeguards our shipping and small boat population. On Friday of this week, it will start the annual ice patrol to discover and warn shipping of icebergs that might cause damage to vessels.

Only recently, on February 29 of this year, its vessels in Vietnam added to the glorious tradition of the service by preventing delivery of hundreds of tons of war materials to the Vietcong. In one engagement on that day, the Coast Guard cutter *Winona*, assisted by an 82-foot Coast Guard patrol boat, destroyed an enemy trawler loaded with ammunition. On the same day, the *Androskoggin*, with two small patrol boats and small Navy boats, drove another trawler ashore where its crew destroyed it. A third was turned back by the cutter *Minnetonka*. This series of engagements have been hailed as the largest naval victory of the Far East war. Shortly thereafter, the service was called upon to minimize the effects of the breaking in two of an oil laden tanker in San Juan Harbor, P.R.

In another activity during the same period, it attempted unsuccessfully the rescue of four Cuban defectors off the Virginia coast.

In addition to these activities, it performs its daily but chiefly unsung services to the 8 million small boat operators of the country. In order to perform services it requires equipment. The greatest part of its fleet of large cutters of the type presently engaged in Vietnam are over-age and require replacement. Because of the conflicting needs of various segments of the country, it has been impossible to replace these as rapidly as the needs of the service dictate.

The bill as presented to the committee provided for replacement of but one of these vessels, and the committee, recognizing the need of the service for greater updating in this category, increased the authorization to three such vessels.

As an illustration of the situation in

which the Coast Guard finds itself, six of the earlier built vessels constructed in 1936 are scheduled for upgrading to permit their operation for a decade or two more.

In the same category are improvements scheduled for smaller vessels, notably buoy tenders, where changes are to be made to increase their habitability. Generally, these vessels are engaged in the unglamorous service of looking after aids to navigation in our nearby waters, and service on them is far from comfortable. In order to permit their operation sometime in the future, it is proposed to make changes that will make them more attractive to their crews, thus assuring higher morale with the corresponding increase in enlistment rates.

Our icebreaker fleet of eight vessels, with one exception, dates back to the early forties, and by reason of increased functions is operating with substantially increased crews. Three of these vessels still have the 1940 quarters, and money is provided to enlarge crew spaces and to provide for greater comfort for the men necessarily serving aboard them.

Other vessels to be constructed include a buoy tender for the Chesapeake, which will replace two old ones and permit greater economies in the service rendered in that area.

In addition, Coast Guard will assume the responsibility for aids to navigation in the remainder of the lower Mississippi, which requires a vessel and supporting shore facilities.

In the aircraft field, nine helicopters are provided which will replace other machines that are overage. Many of the smaller Coast Guard stations are over 50 years old, and efforts are made annually to replace a small number of these.

In addition, training facilities are maintained at Yorktown, Va., Cape May, N.J., and Alameda, Calif. Certain of these facilities require expansion, and World War II buildings still in use demand replacement, which will serve, not only to upgrade training, but will substantially reduce maintenance.

The base at Governors Island is scheduled for construction of family quarters of 160 units. This item was discussed last year, but was deferred at that time. It represents a substantial contribution to the morale of the men serving in the New York area, since at present they are required to pay high rents and commute considerable distances to the base.

In addition, a long overdue sewage disposal system is to be installed which will serve to reduce to some degree the pollution of New York Harbor.

The remaining item of significance in the bill is for continued work on bridges in Louisiana and Illinois, which constitute serious restrictions to navigation of waterways. This last item is under the Truman-Hobbs Act, which provides for cost sharing with the bridge owners for the removal of navigational obstructions.

The amount sought by the Coast Guard in its bill is virtually the same as last year. The committee added two large cutters at \$14.5 million apiece, because it is convinced of the growing need of vessels of this type.

I feel that an extended defense of these expenditures is not necessary, since all of the Members of this body are familiar with the service rendered by the Coast Guard and should be convinced of the need to provide it with sufficient equipment to do the job that we all know it can do.

I point out that the bill was reported unanimously by the committee, and it is my conviction that the amount sought herein is an absolute minimum to permit the Coast Guard to function properly.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the Coast Guard Subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

Following the chairman's discussion of Coast Guard needs, I do not believe that there is a great deal left to be said. However, I do feel that there are certain points that should be emphasized to illustrate the needs of the Coast Guard.

The bill as submitted to the committee called for the construction of two large vessels; one, a high endurance cutter, and the second, an oceanographic cutter. The committee added two high endurance cutters at \$14.5 million each, a total of \$29 million.

As has been previously called to the attention of this committee, the Coast Guard is woefully behind in its cutter replacement program. At the moment, five of these vessels are serving with great distinction off the coast of Vietnam. Everyone of them is overage, and the committee has been very concerned over their probable remaining useful life in the future. In fact, the Coast Guard has been reduced to seeking funds in this bill for the rehabilitation of six vessels built in 1936, since at the present rate of replacement, it is probable that these vessels will have to operate for more than 10 years in the future. At this time, money has been provided for replacement of 10 vessels and one is actually in operation. Twenty-three await replacement. We feel that the replacement rate is far too low and, in consequence, have added the additional two cutters. We may add that we are fully conscious of the fiscal problems confronting the country, but we believe that this particular area is one of which we are likely to be pennywise and pound foolish.

With respect to the other items in the bill, they call for a continuing program of various facilities, both in the training area and in shore stations. In general, the buildings to be replaced in the training field are World War II models that have long since been obsolete, and maintenance is excessively high.

With respect to the small shore stations, a similar situation exists. Many of the buildings are well over 50 years in age, and replacement is long since overdue.

The other major items in the bill are for replacement of overage aircraft, and for continuing work on railroad bridges under the Truman-Hobbs Act.

I believe that the bill merits your favorable consideration and I do not anticipate any great controversy over its provisions. The record of the Coast Guard is such that it has the respect of virtually every Member of the House. Its reputation for modesty in its demands

is such that relatively little time will be needed to present the merits of its claims.

I, as chairman of the Coast Guard Subcommittee, and all of the members of the committee, believe that the claims of the Coast Guard to your favorable action need no extended discussion by me. You are all aware of the value of the Coast Guard to every one of us. In the interests of our safety, we must see that it has the needed equipment to perform its many functions.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill and concur wholeheartedly in what the chairman has said.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished colleagues on our Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries who have urged passage of the bill, H.R. 15224.

There is little need for me to enlarge upon what already has been said concerning the provisions of this legislation. Briefly, as originally introduced pursuant to Executive Communication No. 1479, H.R. 15224 would have authorized \$107 million for acquisitions, construction, and improvements by the Coast Guard. Your Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries made but one amendment to this administration request. It increased the authorization by \$29 million to furnish funds for three high-endurance cutters instead of one. Thus the total amount authorized for appropriation by H.R. 15224 has been raised by committee action from \$107 million to \$136 million. The needs of the Coast Guard to meet the ever-expanding demands placed upon it clearly justify this increase.

As our national interests have grown, so too has the role of the Coast Guard. Its duties have been continually expanding to meet ever-changing demands and conditions both at home and abroad. Last year, for example, as a result of its transfer to the Department of Transportation, the Coast Guard acquired an additional responsibility from the Corps of Engineers under the Truman-Hobbs Act for alteration of bridges over navigable waters. This year—in fact, less than 2 weeks ago—the Coast Guard was cited for possible additional duties in the field of marine sciences. In his message of March 8, "To Renew a Nation," the President stated:

This year we can begin development of improved ocean buoys. I urge the Congress to approve my request for \$5 million in the Fiscal 1969 Coast Guard budget for this program.

Although this ocean buoys program is in the Coast Guard's research and development budget request and not in this authorization measure, H.R. 15224, it does represent a new responsibility and an area in which we on the Committee on Merchant Marine can anticipate future authorization requests.

Abroad, the Coast Guard and its personnel still are engaged in the Vietnam conflict. Deployed in the area are five high-endurance cutters, 26 patrol craft, and an electronic long-range, aids-to-navigation system manned by more than 1,350 Coast Guard personnel.

Mr. Chairman, the Coast Guard has responded willingly and ably to each of these many demands. Unfortunately, our generosity in placing demands upon this service has not been commensurate with our funding for much-needed new equipment and facilities. Each year we on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries have tried to place the needs in line with the demands by appropriate increases in the authorization. Yet each year we have seen authorizing legislation like H.R. 15224 enacted into law only to find the amount drastically reduced in the appropriation process to the low level originally requested by the administration. This occurred in each of the 3 previous fiscal years—1966, 1967, and 1968. I sincerely hope that a similar fate does not lie in wait for the measure now under consideration.

The present fleet of Coast Guard cutters has an average service life of almost 25 years. At the present rate of replacement of one per year, replacement of the remaining 23 cutters reaching obsolescence will not be completed for more than 20 years. We, therefore, face the very distinct possibility of having to keep in service cutters in excess of 40 years of age at this replacement rate. There are limits upon what human endurance can accomplish in overcoming deficiencies in facilities. It is high time that both the administration and the Congress recognize this fact of life.

Before we give the Coast Guard any more duties, let us at least give it the proper tools to accomplish what we now demand of it. H.R. 15224, as amended by your Committee on Merchant Marine, is the first halting step in this direction. I strongly urge all my colleagues in the House to support its passage.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and commend him as well as the ranking minority member, the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MAILLIARD], and especially, Mr. Chairman, do I commend the distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on the Coast Guard, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and the minority leader of the Coast Guard Subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MORTON].

Mr. Chairman, I think it has been ably stated here today that over a period of years, almost one decade, at least, with which I am personally familiar—and history is replete with this fact, also—that prior to the last decade the Coast Guard in its efforts to obtain the essential tools which are necessary to perform its assigned statutory missions and roles has found that these tools have not been provided.

I think my distinguished friend, the gentleman from the great State of Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN], who is also a member of the Committee on Armed Services, will agree with me—and I am so happy to see him here on the floor at this moment—that the Coast Guard

has provided in the South Vietnam war zone 26 of our newest, most recently acquired patrol boats—and they are 82-footers—and that now for over a year we have had off the shores of South Vietnam five of our high-endurance cutters. These, of course, were taken from their essential Coast Guard roles and missions where they are so badly needed in the coastal waters of this country and in their offshore duty stations.

Mr. Chairman, I wish the time would come when the Department of Defense would reimburse the Coast Guard for these Coast Guard ships they are using. However, I do not know when that time will come.

Mr. Chairman, I do hope that the Committee on Appropriations will see fit to recognize the need, the desperate need, of what we have asked for in this authorization bill.

In my judgment, and it is my opinion that this judgment is shared by people outside the Congress of the United States that the cost study which has been made not only by the Coast Guard subcommittee but by its parent committee, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, reflects a more comprehensive knowledge of the needs of the Coast Guard than even the agency itself.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I am very hopeful that the Committee on Appropriations will respond to the will of the Congress in its passage of this bill, which passage I believe will be unanimous. It is my further hope that the funds which are essential to the missions and roles of the U.S. Coast Guard will be forthcoming.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENNON. Of course, I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend and to thank the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON] for his eloquent and forceful statement in support of the passage of this bill. Further, Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the remarks which have been made by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts. The distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] has a colleague from his great State, and a personal friend of mine, if I may say so, in the personage of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Transportation, the subcommittee which will pass upon the ultimate funding of this authorization. Therefore, I appeal to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] to use his best counsel and advice in consultation with his colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] in bringing about the necessary appropriations for carrying forth the authorizations which are provided for in this bill.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from California,

the ranking minority member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries [Mr. MAILLIARD].

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, I join my colleagues on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries in urging passage of the bill, H.R. 15224.

In April of last year during consideration by this body of a similar authorization measure, I stated:

The cumulative slippage to date in the Coast Guard's vessel replacement program amounts to \$161.2 million. In terms of vessels, this means the program is 20 ships behind schedule, half of which are of major types such as high and medium endurance cutters and icebreakers needed by the Coast Guard to properly carry out its duties.

This statement was based upon the Coast Guard's so-called cutter plan of 1962 and was correct in that context.

Implementation of this 1962 plan would have required an average annual funding level of approximately \$100 million for the period fiscal year 1965 through fiscal year 1974. The first 3 fiscal years of the plan's implementation—fiscal year 1965 through fiscal year 1967—however, resulted in total appropriations for the cutter plan which were less than 60 percent of requirements. Because of this and in recognition of changing vessel requirements, the Coast Guard undertook a reexamination of its vessel replacement program late in 1966.

Mr. Chairman, in its usual conservative fashion, the Coast Guard's revised cutter plan of 1966 reduced the requirements of its 1962 plan by \$19 million. This was accomplished notwithstanding its acquisition of the entire U.S. fleet of polar icebreakers and a general price increase in vessel construction costs. This revised plan called for an annual requirement level of \$117.6 million for replacement and augmentation of Coast Guard cutters from fiscal year 1968 through fiscal year 1974.

Today, this revised Coast Guard vessel replacement program of 1966 is less than 2 years old. Yet it already has a potential cumulative slippage from fiscal year 1968 and fiscal year 1969 of 15 vessels, which includes six high-endurance cutters and one icebreaker, and which amounts to about \$144 million.

Accordingly, I most strongly urge my colleagues in the House to pass the bill, H.R. 15224, as amended by your Committee on Merchant Marine, to authorize the appropriation of necessary funds for the construction of three high-endurance cutters by the Coast Guard.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHADEBERG], a member of the committee.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 15224.

Last year I served notice to the House that I would oppose the 1969 authorization for the Coast Guard, if in my opinion, its functions relating to boat safety were to be curtailed and more specifically if the Coast Guard station in Racine, Wis., was to be closed down. My position was and still is, that we cannot make economic consideration the sole basis for the safety program of the Coast Guard.

The Coast Guard has a multiplicity of

duties to perform and there are indeed few who would suggest that it is not doing a commendable job in fulfilling all of its varied duties. I fully support the authorization of funds included in this bill to complete the helicopter facilities in Chicago, not as a substitute for the Racine station but as a mean of improving the service contributing to the safety of boat users along the shores of Lake Michigan.

With an increase of sizable numbers in the use of boats for recreational purposes, it is necessary to increase the service and to continually update the quality of its present commendable service.

I have been assured that the Coast Guard does not intend to replace the Racine station by the helicopter service from Chicago, but will continue to give the best possible service to the residents of my district through the upgrading and continuing modernization of its service in keeping with its added and increasing responsibilities to an increasing population.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MURPHY].

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill.

As a Member of Congress from New York City, I am vitally concerned with the passage of this bill because the Coast Guard conducts a wide range of activities throughout the Port of New York.

Recently there has been a consolidation of Coast Guard units at Governor's Island, which included the transfer of the industrial base from Staten Island and the training center from Groton, Conn. Many of the projects authorized by this bill are vitally needed to accommodate this consolidation.

Probably the most vital projects in this bill are those authorizing the construction of new housing. Last year, of 14,000 married Coast Guard personnel, almost 7,000 were inadequately housed; the problem was especially serious in New York City. We have tried to get better housing in this area for a number of years, but with little success. This year's bill authorizes \$8 million for Coast Guard housing construction, a large part of it slated for Governor's Island, and should be approved in its full amount.

A second project on Governor's Island authorized by this bill is the installation of a sanitary sewage system for all buildings on the island. This system will provide a method of collection, pumping, and transporting waste under Buttermilk Channel to a sewer pipeline owned by the city of New York.

At the present time there are no sewage treatment facilities on the island, and untreated wastes—raw sewage—are discharged directly into New York Harbor. This project, which will cost \$2,500,000, is planned to meet standards established in Federal regulations governing pollution.

The third project slated for the island is the acquisition of a new ferryboat to replace an older boat that is beyond repair. The bill authorizes \$150,000 for the

purchase of the 185-foot ferryboat *Tides* from the city of New York. This new boat, which has a 42-car capacity and diesel-electric propulsion, will be the third ferryboat serving the island.

I urge my colleagues to approve the full authorization for each of these projects, and for the entire bill.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN].

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the subcommittee and the full committee handling this legislation, I urge the adoption of the bill as it stands, without any amendments, and I stand behind all of the items that appear in the bill.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1969 for the use of the Coast Guard as follows:

Vessels

For procurement, extension of service life, and increasing capability of vessels, \$38,904,000.

A. Procurement:

- (1) one high-endurance cutter;
- (2) one oceanographic cutter;
- (3) one coastal buoy tender;
- (4) one ferryboat; and
- (5) one river tender and barge.

B. Increasing capability:

- (1) Install generators and air conditioning on five seagoing buoy tenders;
- (2) Improve habitability on two coastal buoy tenders;
- (3) Install air conditioning on one coastal buoy tender; and
- (4) Install balloon tracking radar on two high endurance cutters and modify balloon tracking radar installations on one high endurance cutter.

C. Extension of service life:

- (1) Improve icebreakers; and
- (2) Increase fuel capacity and improve habitability on high endurance cutters.

Aircraft

For procurement of aircraft \$14,636,000.

- (1) nine medium-range helicopters.

Construction

For establishment or development of installations and facilities by acquisition, construction, conversion, extension, or installation of permanent or temporary public works, including the preparation of sites and furnishing of appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following, \$47,660,000.

- (1) Depot, Greenville, Mississippi: Barracks, messing, and operations building; garage; mooring facilities;
- (2) Moorings, Natchez, Mississippi: Mooring facilities;
- (3) Station, Siuslaw River, Florence, Oregon: Barracks, messing, operations, and administration building;
- (4) Station, Hobucken, North Carolina: Barracks, messing, operations, and administration building; convert existing building to garage and storage building, improve facilities;
- (5) Moorings, Juneau, Alaska: Enlarge existing building to provide additional space for electronic spares shipping and receiving area, office space, and other purposes;
- (6) Station, Point Allerton, Hull, Massachusetts: Barracks, messing, operations, and administration building; garage and work-

shop building; mooring facilities; helicopter pad;

(7) Station, Grays Harbor, Westpoint, Washington: Barracks, messing, operations, and administration building;

(8) Station, Port Aransas, Texas: Repair and replace waterfront facilities;

(9) Loran Station, Cape San Blas, Gulf County, Florida: Barracks building; convert existing building for messing and recreation spaces; enlarge loran building, garage and storage building;

(10) Station, Bayfield, Wisconsin: Barracks, messing, and operations building, pier facilities;

(11) Air Station, Mobile, Alabama: Barracks, BOQ and messing building; training, recreational, and exchange facilities, hangar space conversion;

(12) Station, Cape Charles City, Virginia: Barracks, messing, and operations building; mooring facilities, helicopter pad;

(13) Station, Annapolis, Maryland: Barracks, messing, and operations building; mooring facilities;

(14) Western Long Island Sound Development:

(i) Station, New Haven, Connecticut: Barracks, messing, operations, and administration building; mooring facilities;

(ii) Station, Eatons Neck, New York: Recondition barracks, operations, and administration building; improve waterfront facilities; and

(iii) Station, Fort Totten, New York: Recondition barracks, messing, administration, and work-storage facilities;

(15) Base, Portsmouth, Virginia: Dredging, bulkheading, site development, utilities;

(16) Station, San Francisco, California: Barracks building, administration building, subsistence building, waterfront facilities;

(17) Yard, Curtis Bay, Maryland: Modify buildings as necessary to provide for consolidation of metal trades;

(18) Station, San Juan, Puerto Rico: Barracks and messing facilities, waterfront facilities renewal;

(19) Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Dock construction;

(20) Base, Galveston, Texas: Sewage system;

(21) Base, New York, Governors Island, New York: Sewage system;

(22) Station, Portsmouth Harbor, New-castle, New Hampshire: Mooring facilities, garage and workshop buildings;

(23) Various locations: Aids to navigation projects including, where necessary, planning and acquisition of sites;

(24) Arkansas River: Aids to navigation to complete marking of river;

(25) Various locations: Automation of manned light stations;

(26) Various locations: Replace lightships with very large buoys;

(27) Reserve Training Center, Yorktown, Virginia: Galley/mess building;

(28) Reserve Training Center, Yorktown, Virginia: Advanced Engineman School classroom and laboratory building;

(29) Training Center, Cape May, New Jersey: Gymnasium and recreation building;

(30) Training Center, Alameda, California: Recruit barracks;

(31) Training Center, Cape May, New Jersey: Medical-dental building;

(32) Various locations: Public family quarters;

(33) Various locations: Advance planning, construction, design, architectural services, and acquisition of sites in connection with projects not otherwise authorized by law; and

(34) Various locations: Automatic fixed station oceanographic sensor systems and monitor buoys.

SEC. 2. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1969 for payment to bridge owners for the cost of alteration of

railroad and public highway bridges to permit free navigation of the navigable waters of the United States in the amount of \$5,-800,000.

SEC. 3. During fiscal years 1969 through and including 1970, the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating is authorized to lease housing facilities at or near Coast Guard installations wherever located for assignment as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents, if any, without rental charge upon a determination by the Secretary, or his designee, that there is a lack of adequate housing facilities at or near such Coast Guard installations. Such housing facilities may be leased on an individual or multiple unit basis. Expenditures for the rental of such housing facilities may not exceed the average authorized for the Department of Defense.

Mr. GARMATZ (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with and that it be printed in the Record and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 1, line 7, delete "\$38,904,000." and insert in lieu thereof "\$67,904,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 1, line 9, delete "one" and insert in lieu thereof "three".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 1, line 9, delete "cutter;" and insert in lieu thereof "cutters;"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOW

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Bow: On page 2 immediately after line 4, insert the following: "None of the vessels authorized herein shall be procured from other than shipyards and facilities within the United States."

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is similar to an amendment which I introduced last year and which was accepted by the committee.

It provides simply that all of these ships shall be built within yards in the United States.

In view of our present situation as to the balance of payments and other fiscal problems, it seems to me we must build ships within the United States and that we must preserve the shipyards in the United States and so be in a position of not having to depend upon foreign shipyards for the construction of ships.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, there is no objection on this side to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to the amendment on this side.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, there is no objection to the gentleman's amendment on this side, and on behalf of the committee we accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time because the Calumet region is in the district that I represent.

I would ask the chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ] to explain the removal of the bridges from the Calumet River.

Mr. GARMATZ. The bridges to be altered, generally, were built with what are now insufficient vertical or horizontal clearance for free navigation on navigable waters of the United States—and they are in the particular district represented by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Are the expenses to be borne by the Federal Government in part or in whole?

Mr. GARMATZ. The expenses are paid in part by the Federal Government.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Did the gentleman's committee have complete hearings on this matter?

Mr. GARMATZ. No; not in this particular region where the work is being done. The Coast Guard held hearings on these particular sections, but the committee had no hearings.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. And the recommendations of the Coast Guard and the Army Engineers on this matter have been accepted by the committee?

Mr. GARMATZ. That is correct.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. It is my understanding that hearings were held in the district and that an agreement was reached with local thinking. For the information of those interested, I quote from page 7 of Committee Report No. 1165, as follows:

Last year, for the first time, the Coast Guard acquired responsibility from the Corps of Engineers under the Truman-Hobbs Act for alteration of bridges over navigable waters. Under the law, the Secretary of Transportation makes a determination with respect to those bridges that are obstructive to free navigation and these obstacles are removed on a cost-sharing basis by the Government and bridge owner.

The present projects include replacement of the Berwick Bay Bridge, Morgan City, La., and the Calumet River bridges at Chicago, Ill. It is estimated that the total cost of these two projects will run in the neighborhood of \$28 million, of which \$5,800,000 is provided in this bill.

I further quote from the testimony of Adm. W. J. Smith, Commandant, before the Subcommittee on Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey and Navigation, on February 19, 1968, as given on page 31 of the hearings:

Obstructive bridges

Last year we assumed responsibility from the Corps of Engineers for the alteration of obstructive bridges over navigable waters. As you recall the fiscal year 1968 authorization was \$3.8 million. This year's request of \$5.8 million includes phased funding requirements for three of the 16 projects commenced by the Corps of Engineers. Approximately \$47 million will be required in future years to complete projects previously declared obstructive to navigation by the Corps of Engineers.

The only other reference to the removal of obstructive bridges in the hearings is on page 17 where one of the witnesses is quoted as saying that the \$37,963,000 figure for the construction and development of facilities includes the funds for the bridge removal.

Mr. Chairman, I could not let this occasion pass without joining my colleagues in hearty congratulation to the Coast Guard on a job superbly done. It is doubtful if any agency arm, or instrumentality of the Federal Government does so much in so many different fields of activity and with so little money. We in Chicago see very much of the Coast Guard in action, and the more we see the more we admire and applaud.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GILBERT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 15224) to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard, pursuant to House Resolution 1095, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES,

Washington, D.C., March 18, 1968.

HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 194 of title 14 of the United States Code, I have appointed the following members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy for the year 1968: HON. FRANK M. CLARK, of Pennsylvania; HON. ALTON LENNON, of North Carolina; HON. JAMES R. GROVER, Jr., of New York.

As chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am authorized to serve as an ex officio member of the Board.

Sincerely,

EDWARD A. GARMATZ,
Chairman.

A COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES,

Washington, D.C., March 18, 1968.

HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to Public Law 301 of the 78th Congress, I have appointed the following members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy for the year 1968: HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING, of Virginia; HON. JOHN M. MURPHY, of New York; HON. CHARLES A. MOSHER, of Ohio.

As chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am authorized to serve as an ex officio member of the Board.

Sincerely,

EDWARD A. GARMATZ,
Chairman.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 59]

Baring	Hagan	Resnick
Blackburn	Halleck	Roth
Boggs	Hanna	St. Onge
Burton, Utah	Holland	Selden
Conyers	Irwin	Shriver
Cowger	King, Calif.	Skubitz
Davis, Ga.	Landrum	Stubblefield
Dent	McEwen	Tunney
Derwinski	Miller, Calif.	Watts
Diggs	Moorhead	Wylie
Dingell	Mosher	
Edwards, Calif.	Puroell	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 399 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PROVIDING FOR INCREASED PARTICIPATION BY THE UNITED STATES IN THE INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 1096) providing for the consideration of H.R. 15364, to provide for increased participation by the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1096

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 15364) to provide for increased participation by the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN], pending which I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1096 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 15364 to provide for increased participation by the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank, and for other purposes.

H.R. 15364 amends the Inter-American Development Bank Act to authorize the U.S. Governor of the Bank—the Secretary of the Treasury—to vote in favor of a \$1 billion increase in the authorized callable capital stock of the Bank and to agree on behalf of the United States to subscribe its proportionate share of the increase—\$411,760,000.

The bill also authorizes an appropriation, without fiscal year limitation, of \$411,760,000 for use by the Secretary in subscribing to the increase. Two equal appropriations of \$205,880,000 each will be sought, the first in 1968 and the second in 1970, as called for in the April 1967 resolution of the Board of Governors of the Bank, which is the basis for the present action. These subscriptions as such involve no budgetary expenditure and it is not foreseen that the shares once subscribed will be called by the Bank for cash payment by the United States.

The Bank's Latin American member countries will subscribe to \$544,900,000 of the \$1 billion increase, and the balance of

\$43,340,000 will remain unassigned on the books of the Bank.

The Inter-American Development Bank is continuing to provide leadership and funds on normal banking terms for the acceleration of Latin American economic and social development. In fulfilling this fundamental objective the Bank has become a key element in the Alliance for Progress.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 1096 in order that H.R. 15364 may be considered.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

As the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] has stated, House Resolution 1096 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for the consideration of H.R. 15364 to provide for increased participation by the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury, as our member of the Board of Governors of the Inter-American Development Bank, to vote for a \$1,000,000,000 increase in the authorized callable capital stock of the Bank and to agree for the United States to subscribe our proportionate share, \$411,760,000.

Callable capital stock subscriptions are really contingent liabilities of the subscribing nation which enables the Bank to borrow in world capital markets for lending to Latin American nations, the members of the Bank along with the United States. Such subscriptions are not paid in cash when subscribed for. Appropriations covering our prior subscriptions totaling \$611,800,000 have been made. They are carried on the books of the Treasury, and no actual funding is involved.

As previously indicated, enactment should have no effect on the U.S. budgetary situation. Appropriations to cover our subscriptions will be made but will only be a bookkeeping entry for the Treasury. Apparently no funds need be set aside in a separate account nor have any actually been expended in the past. The purpose of the appropriations by member nations is to create a reservoir of credit upon which to float Bank borrowings which are used to make development loans.

The report notes that to insure only a small impact on U.S. balance-of-payments difficulties, the Bank has more and more conducted its borrowing in foreign capital markets.

This bill, the committee points out, is necessary now because of agreements the Bank has made with existing bond holders that it will not make larger borrowings than the U.S. subscription of callable capital stock—now totaling \$611,800,000. Total Bank debt as of December 31, 1967, stood at \$513,600,000, leaving only \$98,300,000 in borrowing capacity. This is insufficient, together with the existing cash balance of \$52,400,000 to finance the Bank's lending operations which are projected at about \$175,000,000 annually.

Under terms of the bill, \$1,000,000,000 in callable stock is to be authorized. The

share of the United States is \$11,760,000, while that of the rest of the Latin American member nations is \$544,900,000. The Treasury will seek two appropriations of \$205,880,000, the first in 1968 and the second in 1970.

The bill was reported unanimously by the committee, but I have certain reservations that the measure not be passed. But, Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 15364) to provide for increased participation by the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 15364, with Mr. DELANEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WINNALL] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Congress should act promptly and favorably on H.R. 15364 to increase the callable capital of the Inter-American Development Bank.

The Inter-American Development Bank has formally adopted a posture of full cooperation with the United States in feasible measures to help solve the U.S. balance-of-payments problem. In a recent report of the Bank's executive directors it was stated:

In the light of these (balance of payments) problems, which should be regarded as basically transitory in nature, the Bank and its members fully appreciate the difficulties inherent in United States responsibilities in the free world. Accordingly, the Bank proposes to cooperate in the greatest possible degree with the United States in meeting these difficulties by suitable measures, which obviously would be subject to review as conditions change.

Partly in order to achieve a desirable diversification of its sources of funds and partly as an element in its cooperation with the United States regarding the U.S. balance-of-payments problem, the Bank has intensified its efforts in recent years to obtain an increasing proportion of its capital requirements by floating bonds in capital markets other than in the United States. As my colleague has already indicated, during 1967, the Bank

borrowed a net total of \$146 million in the world's capital markets, of which \$36 million—about 25 percent of the total—was raised abroad and \$110 million was raised by two borrowings in the United States. These borrowings brought the Bank's total funded debt to \$513.6 million at the end of 1967, of which \$335 million was raised in the United States and the remainder—approximately 35 percent—was obtained from the Bank's Latin American member countries and from nonmember countries.

On October 15, 1967, the Bank took a further significant action which had the dual effect of helping to generate additional funds from nonmember countries and of showing its understanding and constructive attitude regarding the U.S. balance-of-payments problem. On that date the Bank announced plans for the adoption of measures aimed at mobilizing additional financial resources for Latin America's development from countries not currently members of the Bank. These measures will condition procurement financed with ordinary capital loans in economically advanced nonmember countries on an appropriate contribution of resources to the Bank by the respective country. Procurement under ordinary capital loans now takes place on an international competitive bidding basis.

This new policy, effective January 1, 1968, applies to a list of economically advanced countries initially consisting of Austria, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, New Zealand, Norway, South Africa, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom.

The Bank's cooperation with respect to the U.S. balance-of-payments problem is also demonstrated in its handling of the proceeds from the flotation of bond issues in the U.S. capital market. This cooperation has taken the form of undertakings on the part of the Bank to invest in the United States the proceeds from the sale of bonds to U.S. investors in such manner as to eliminate any effect on the U.S. balance of payments until the end of 1969. Under these conditions the Bank's loan flotations in the United States have no early impact on our balance of payments. It is only at a later stage when the proceeds from such issues are disbursed under loan contracts that the Bank's ordinary capital transactions may affect the U.S. balance-of-payments situation. These undertakings to invest proceeds of bond issues in the United States help assure the Bank's ordinary capital operations will have only minimal effect on the U.S. balance of payments.

These actions of the Bank speak for themselves and I urge rapid and favorable action on H.R. 15364.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 15364, a bill to authorize the U.S. Governor of the Bank to vote in favor of a \$1 billion increase in the authorized callable capital stock of the Inter-American Development Bank and to agree on behalf of the United States to secure its proportionate share of the increase—\$411,760,000.

First, I would like to remind the House that I think it is notable that this bill was reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency by a unanimous vote. I think this represents a solid vote of confidence by the standing committee of the House which has legislative jurisdiction over the Inter-American Development Bank. It is also interesting to note that never has the House of Representatives defeated legislation proposing U.S. membership or U.S. subscriptions to multilateral lending institutions. Apparently, the public as well as the Congress prefers multilateral lending institutions to the more traditional forms of bilateral grant assistance. I might also say that this unblemished record of support by the Congress could not have occurred without a solid performance by these institutions; it could not have occurred had Congress uncovered the waste and in certain instance corruption that has been associated with our bilateral grant aid program.

In this connection, I think that Robert N. Burr, author of a book entitled "Our Troubled Hemisphere," published by the Brookings Institution, recently put his finger on it. As we all know, since World War II, the United States has unselfishly committed itself to massive programs of assistance to less developed nations throughout the world. One of the most vexing questions facing the Congress throughout the postwar period was how to "tie" benevolent strings to such foreign assistance without making it appear that the United States was applying too heavy a hand of interference in the internal affairs of these governments. Mr. Burr, in explaining why the multilateral lending approach has been relatively successful in this regard stated:

There are both technical and political advantages to U.S. support of multilateral aid. International bodies can provide a broader range of technical skills and more knowledge specifically relevant to the problems of Latin America than can the United States acting alone. Multilateral agencies can demand conditions from loan recipients that the United States might be altogether unable to obtain or able to only at the risk of alienating the recipient.

Mr. Burr continued:

Thus, by delegating the administration of aid funds to multinational bodies, the United States can work for the desired development of the Latin American nations more effectively and with fewer political problems than by administering its funds directly. Finally, by giving support to multinational aid entities, the United States is contributing to the building of an infrastructure for a peaceful world of free and independent nations.

I might add that U.S. assistance through the Inter-American Development Bank to Latin America already nearly equals our bilateral grant aid. It might also be useful to remind the Members of the House that the Inter-American Development Bank came into being in 1959, and the participation of the United States was at the urging of former President Eisenhower. At the present time its membership comprises 21 Western Hemisphere nations, including the United States.

The Bank's operations are carried out through two principal loan funds or

"windows," the ordinary capital window, which is the subject of this proposed legislation and the fund for special operations which was replenished with additional capital last year.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps another reason a bill of this magnitude can come before us this afternoon with a unanimous committee vote is because this institution, in its brief history, has generated economic and social development projects in Latin America with an estimated total cost of about \$6.4 billion. I use the word "generated" because this magnitude of project activity resulted from loans amounting to \$2.4 billion. In short, the IDB has had a multiplier effect on its loans of approximately 2.7 to 1. I might emphasize that our bilateral grant assistance programs rarely provided a multiplier effect of this magnitude.

It might also interest the Members of the House to know the types of project lending this institution has financed. Agriculture development projects have been the Bank's primary interest, accounting for approximately 23.1 percent of total projects to date. It was at the suggestion of members of our Subcommittee on International Finance that the percentage of projects aimed at increasing agricultural food production be increased even more, and there is evidence that the Bank has accepted many of our subcommittee's suggestions. Of the Bank's loans, 21.4 percent have gone to industry and mining, 16.5 percent to water and sewage projects, 12 percent to housing, 10.2 percent to transportation and communications, 9.4 percent to electrical power projects, and 4.3 percent to education. Preinvestment and export financing accounted for the remaining 3.1 percent.

One of the growing characteristics of the Bank has been the increasing support it has given to Latin American economic integration. Since it was first established, it has sought opportunities to foster the economic union of the Latin American countries in the belief that such unity is one of the most effective means of accelerating the area's development.

Realizing the need for self-help and reform as indispensable to progress, the Bank works closely with the Inter-American Committee on the Alliance for Progress—CIAP—which is the multilateral entity which establishes standards of performance and evaluates institutional progress of the member countries, including fiscal and monetary reform. In this regard, the Bank also cooperates closely with the other financing entities in Latin America such as AID, the World Bank, the United Nations Development Program, and others in an effort to avoid overlapping and to interrelate all development programs of the region.

Members of the House should be pleased to learn that the IDB has been making every effort to avoid adverse balance-of-payments impact here in the United States resulting from its lending and borrowing operations. As of December 31, 1967, the Bank had outstanding borrowings amounting to \$513 million obtained in the capital markets of the United States and abroad. Of this

amount, 35 percent was obtained in foreign capital markets, thus relieving a potentially adverse balance-of-payments impact. During the past 2 years nearly 60 percent of its borrowings have been in foreign capital markets. Last October, the Bank took a further significant action when it announced plans for the adoption of measures aimed at mobilizing additional financial resources for Latin American development from countries not currently members of the Bank. These measures will condition procurement financed with ordinary capital loans in only those economically advanced nonmember countries which contribute resources to the Bank.

Finally, regardless of the merits of any proposal before the House in these troubled times, we must be especially careful of the budgetary impact. In this regard, the IDB has not needed to call any of its present callable capital and the funds appropriated for the U.S. share thus far have remained with the U.S. Treasury.

Mr. Chairman, it is essential that we take favorable action on this legislation during this session of Congress if the Bank is to maintain its current level of operations. The Inter-American Development Bank has often been called the Bank of the Alliance. As the ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I am proud of the bipartisan support Congress has always shown for hemispheric progress. I am certain that an overwhelming majority of the House will again give its stamp of approval to this excellent institution.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, on page 2 of the bill, line 3—quoting in part—"to agree on behalf of the United States to subscribe to its proportionate share of the \$1,000,000,000 increase in the authorized callable capital stock of the Bank"—and it provides for an authorization of \$411,760,000.

What is the proportionate share involved? What is the basis for the proportionate share of the United States?

Mr. WIDNALL. In this institution our share is less than 50 percent. I do not have the figures with me here, but I shall get them for the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BROCK. If my recollection is correct, the figure is 41 percent.

Mr. GROSS. But what is the basis for our "proportionate share"? Who fixes the proportionate share of the U.S. Government?

Mr. WIDNALL. This is based, after talks and after agreements between the nations who are going into the operation, and the program is based upon the specific interest of the United States in helping development of the South and Central American States; and much has been utilized for the purchase of products in the United States which policy has

provided employment and opportunity for employment in this country.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I still do not have an answer to the question as to how the "proportionate share" of the United States is actually arrived at.

What official stipulates as to what the United States will put into this Fund?

Mr. WIDNALL. No official stipulates this amount. This is arrived at after agreement, after consultation between the nations involved.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BROCK. This agreement was included in the initial charter which was established for this institution. We have two different participation accounts, one is the fund for special operations. We had that matter pending before us last year and that largely involves soft loans. The other facet of the operation is the hard loan window. Here the percentage was established by a director appointed by each nation in the original drawing up of the charter. This procedure is adhered to by the participating nations involved. Since the Bank has been in existence, this has been the case.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey yield further?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield further to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. So, then, an aggregation of individuals can meet down at Rio de Janeiro and vote to impose a tax upon the people of this country by the indication of saying, "You will put up so much money"; is that right?

Mr. WIDNALL. This is not forced upon the people of this country. The Congress of the United States has the ability to enact its will if it feels the proportionate share is unfair, unwise, or anything else.

We are delighted with the operation of this Bank, and some others, where we have been able to get the accord, the interest, and the participation of many, many other nations into an agreement where we do not have the big and majority share we used to have in connection with promoting overseas programs.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. REUSS. I would say, in support of the answers which have been just given by the gentleman from New Jersey and the gentleman from Tennessee to the gentleman from Iowa, that those answers are completely correct.

The original 41 percent of the U.S. share of paid-in capital was determined when the articles of agreement were signed, and those articles of agreement were fully ratified by the Congress of the United States, by both this body and the other body, and subjected to full and searching debate.

That percentage cannot be changed without the consent of the Congress of the United States. And I point out that, although our share of the paid-in capital is 41 percent, our vote is 42 percent. We gained that fractional percentage point.

I would also point out that we are the only wealthy country in an organization of poor countries, yet they are putting in 59 percent of the total capital.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

My concern is with the balance-of-payments program and the international financial condition that this country finds itself in. I wonder if the gentleman would address himself to the authorization here of \$411,760,000, and to what effect, if any, in his opinion, this will have on the balance-of-payments problem?

Mr. WIDNALL. I do not believe it is going to have any adverse effect on the balance-of-payments problem, or program, as far as the United States is concerned. This is callable, and we have much more that is callable currently in the program that has not been called.

This organization has been able to keep going by outside borrowings by the issuance of securities that have been sold in other countries. It has been a tremendous program in promoting some good will throughout the Western Hemisphere, and we have a multilateral agreement and we do not anticipate any adverse effect on the balance-of-payments problem.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, perhaps I can answer, and add some clarification to the question asked by the gentleman.

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield further to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BROCK. What we are doing is, in effect, guaranteeing operations of the Bank without any input of U.S. capital whatsoever. There is outstanding about \$750 million callable, none of which has ever been called since the inception of the Bank. But in order to get money on the open market, this Bank needed some collateral, some security, and that is the callable stock. With this collateral they can float a half-billion-dollar loan on the European financial market, get a better interest rate, and get more money put up. This callable stock is needed in order to back them up. And that is the real purpose of the American participation.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROCK. I do not have control of the time.

Mr. WIDNALL. I have control of the time. I yield briefly to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Some of that comes from the United States, of course; does it not?

Mr. BROCK. I am sure the gentleman would not object to the U.S. banks loaning money on which they get a significant return.

Mr. CURTIS. I will have something to say about that later. We are talking about whether it has an impact on the international balance of payments, and the answer is, Yes, of course it does.

Mr. BROCK. I would frankly disagree, because I do not believe you can consider our investment as a direct effect on the balance of payments.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I have

control of the time, and I have consumed about 18 minutes. I have other Members I have to yield to, so I decline to yield further.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of H.R. 15364. It is not often that this House has the opportunity to act on legislation which is so amply justified by need and so amply justified by deed as this bill to authorize U.S. participation in an increase of the callable ordinary capital stock of the Inter-American Development Bank. The need has been fully demonstrated and the actions—the deeds—of the Bank in furthering the economic and social development of our Latin American sister Republics are beyond question. Thousands of acres of otherwise infertile land have been brought under cultivation as a consequence of the Bank's loan and technical assistance operations. Potable water and workable sewage and drainage systems have been brought to millions of Latin American citizens who have not had such simple—and perhaps too much taken for granted in the United States—amenities for centuries. Latin cities have power, reliable and usable electric power, for houses, for factories, and for industry, because of this Bank's lending operations. There are now thousands of miles of highways, bearing trucks and cars, carts and bicycles, where before there were dirt roads and trucks. Markets have been opened where none existed before. Ports to accommodate ships to take the produce of the farms and factories have been created. Educational facilities have been created and improved. Technicians and advisers are helping, under the auspices of the Bank, to create viable economic systems, to overcome handicaps bred in poverty and ignorance, to show the way for Latin American progress and prosperity.

The Bank has not, of course, and cannot be expected singlehandedly to solve all of the economic problems of Latin America. Bilateral assistance is still needed. Private investment has an extremely important role to play. And the Latin Americans themselves must channel their funds and their resources into this great task. But the Bank, acting both as a direct lender and as a catalyst encouraging the flow of funds to needed economic and social development projects in Latin America, must continue its great work. Action on this bill will serve this purpose and I urge that the Congress act promptly to approve this bill.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN].

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I join my chairman and the members of the Banking and Currency Committee in supporting this legislation.

The Inter-American Development Bank is a regional hemispheric agency whose members are all the Latin American countries—except Cuba—and the United States. The Bank's legal existence dates from December 30, 1959. The most recent member, Trinidad and Tobago, joined the Bank in 1967. The stated pur-

pose of the Bank is to contribute to "the acceleration of the process of economic development of the member countries." Since it began operations in 1961, the "Bank of the Alliance," as it is sometimes called, has assumed a role of central importance in the planning and financing of economic and social development in Latin America.

The basic capital available to the Bank consists of its ordinary capital resources and its fund for special operations. In addition, the Bank administers the social progress trust fund of \$525 million for the United States, and several other special funds established by Canada, Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden, and Britain amounting to \$85 million.

At this time the Bank has committed almost all of the capital available to it for its ordinary operations, and without affirmative action by this Congress and by each of the other member governments will be unable to continue its activities at an adequate level. Most of the Latin American members have already taken appropriate action. Concurrence by the United States will bring the increase into effect. The bill before us today asks us to endorse and support the future operations of the Bank. Although this would include an authorization of \$411.7 million, it is unlikely that a single dollar of these funds, like our earlier contributions to the callable resources of the Bank, will ever be spent. It is essentially a bookkeeping transaction.

Recently, things have been quiet in Latin America. I feel that this is due in no small measure to this institution which is working so hard to fulfill where it can, the rising expectations of the Latin American people. The United States indicated its deep interest in the process of peaceful development and our commitment to provide financial support for development in signing the Alliance for Progress. The Bank's work is an essential element of the Alliance. The investment which is being proposed here, that the United States make in this Bank, may be preventive medicine which will obviate the necessity of larger authorizations for funds to cope with more serious military problems in our own hemisphere. I urge you to support the Banking and Currency Committee by voting in favor of H.R. 15364 as reported.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN].

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 15364, to provide for increased participation by the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank. Indeed, it is difficult to imagine on what grounds one could oppose this legislation, as I shall explain shortly. Our subcommittee on International Finance held hearings on this bill and not a single voice was raised against it. Rather, there was nothing but praise for the bank operation and objectives.

The bill would authorize the U.S. Governor of the Bank to vote for a \$1 billion increase in the callable capital stock of the Bank, and would authorize the proportionate U.S. contribution to this increase of \$411.8 million. On the basis of this added stock, the Bank, which has currently almost reached the limit of

its borrowing and lending capacity, would be able to make additional borrowings from which it could offer loans for constructive development projects in Latin America.

As brought out so eloquently by the distinguished chairman and by the ranking minority member of the full committee, the history of the Inter-American Development Bank since its inception has been one of sound financing resulting in significant contributions to the economic progress of the Latin American nations. The Bank's total authorized loans of \$2.4 billion through December of 1967 have initiated projects of a total cost of \$6.4 billion. Thus, these loans have succeeded in generating a majority participation in the relevant projects by non-Bank sources.

The repayment record of the Bank's borrowers has been outstanding; only two loans, or about 1 percent of total commitments, are in default, and even these have not yet been written off the books and processes for recoup are now taking place. And I should point out that these loans were made in the earlier days before the more rigid terms were established. Furthermore, the relatively recent policy of requiring Government guarantees for these loans more or less insures that even this remarkable repayment record will be surpassed.

The extraordinary soundness of the Bank's financial position relates directly to the minimal effect the added U.S. participation will have on our domestic budget or international payments deficit. The new contribution is to be in the form of callable capital; that is, capital which is on call as backing for Bank borrowings from private investors. It is from these borrowings that the Bank's loans are made, rather than directly from subscribed callable capital. Our contribution serves merely as a guarantee to the private investors that their loans to the Bank will be repaid.

Thus far, there has been no call on that capital we have already subscribed to the Inter-American Development Bank, and the soundness of that institution's operations indicate little probability that there will be any greater demand for an actual transfer of this additional subscription. Thus, it is likely that no funds will, as a result of our new contribution, actually change hands. We are merely earmarking certain funds as a guarantee to private investors, a promise that, in the event of a default by one of the Bank's borrowers, the Bank will not lack money to pay off its debts.

The only possible effect of this expanded callable capital subscription on our balance-of-payments position would be an indirect one. There would be no direct capital outflow to the Bank from the U.S. Government but the Bank might, with its added supply of guarantee funds, float new bond issues; some of these might be sold in the United States and would then constitute a private capital outflow.

First, however, we must note that the Bank has initiated a new policy, designed to the greatest possible extent to place additional bond issues in capital markets other than that of the United States. This policy should greatly limit the flow

of private capital from U.S. investors to the Bank.

Furthermore, it is important to bear in mind that Treasury Department estimates demonstrate that the overall effect of the operations of the Inter-American Development Bank on our balance of payments has been a positive one. Even before its decision to draw as little private capital as possible from the United States, the demand for U.S. exports generated by the Bank's activities has more than offset the negative effect of private capital outflows in the form of loans to the Bank.

Mr. Speaker, as I stated earlier, I find it difficult to conceive of any rational grounds for objection to this legislation. On the other hand, I believe that our commitment to aid in the development of our Latin American neighbors, which is tantamount to a commitment to our own national security and economic prosperity, requires acceptance of this measure. I thus urge overwhelming approval by this body of H.R. 15364.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALPERN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman, as the ranking minority member of the International Finance Subcommittee, as well as the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Brock] and other Members of the minority who have interested themselves so constructively in this legislation. I want to commend them for the kind of bipartisan support that they have given to this bill. It bears the unanimous approval of the House Committee on Banking and Currency and I think the reasons that are now being given by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] are the best evidence as to why it received that unanimous support.

I again want to express my gratitude to the gentlemen.

Mr. HALPERN. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO].

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Chairman, the present bill—H.R. 15364—authorizes our country's participation in an expansion of the callable ordinary capital resources of the Inter-American Development Bank. Participation in this expansion would reflect our country's continued interest in the economic and technological progress of Latin American countries and our desire to accelerate social progress among millions of human beings.

Last April, the Inter-American Development Bank's Board of Governors recommended to member governments that appropriate steps be taken to increase the resources of the bank so that it in turn could achieve greater success in meeting capital requirements necessary for continued economic development. These recommendations included a 3-year increase, starting in 1967, in the Fund for Special Operations, the so-called "soft-loan window" with relatively low interest rates and long maturity

periods, and an increase this year in the callable ordinary capital for hard loans, or loans similar to commercial bank loans with higher interest rates for normal duration lengths. Last year the Congress approved the first recommendation, and the increase of money for soft loans is now being implemented. By approving the second recommendation, which does not involve an actual expenditure of funds, we will help the IADB to raise money by borrowing in the various capital markets of the world.

Since 1960, the Congress has appropriated \$612 million for authorized capital stock of the IADB. This money has remained with the U.S. Treasury—as a guarantee behind the bonds sold in capital markets. H.R. 15364 would increase the callable capital by \$411,760,000, to be subscribed in two equal portions, the first before the end of this fiscal year and the second before 1970. Not \$1 of the \$612 million already appropriated has ever been spent, nor is it likely that \$1 of the proposed \$411.7 million will ever be spent. Our country's guarantee—the strength behind the bonds that the IADB sells—enables the Bank to raise its funds from private sources, both here and abroad, with no or little deleterious effect on our balance-of-payments position. These funds finance sound development projects essential to continued economic growth and social progress of Latin America.

The Inter-American Development Bank is the heart of the Alliance for Progress, and the Bank's callable capital is the heart of its dynamic operations that have been admirably successful in enabling Latin American countries to progress toward the realization of essential national and regional hemispheric goals. By increasing the callable capital in 1968—as we did in 1964—we will help accelerate the pace of progress and decrease the distance between human aspiration and achievement.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman from New Jersey to use the remainder of his time, for we have only one more speaker on this side.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York said that he could not imagine a rational reason for being against this measure. Well, I will try to present one.

There is no question that the United States is overextended in its expenditures abroad. We are in a very critical situation. The Ways and Means Committee, of course, has one aspect of this overextension in relation to our travel abroad as well as to our private investments abroad.

The same arguments—and I have used them—about the private investment abroad not hitting our balance of payments and being a plus were exactly the arguments that were used by the proponents of the Inter-American Development Bank. Actually this is true.

In my judgment, we are making a big mistake in moving in and cutting off private investment abroad. But the administration is doing it in three different ways:

First, through the interest equalization tax, which we passed and is law, and which I opposed.

Second, through the Executive order cutting back direct investment.

Third, the so-called "voluntary" action of the Federal Reserve System in relation to the lending institutions. What we have before us, I believe, is a job that we have never undertaken in the Congress of trying to bring about some coordination of the various programs—and all of them are good—that come out of different committees.

When we list them—and I am going to try to list them—I think I would list this very Inter-American Development Bank as one of the best and finest. I put my stamp of approval on what the committee has said. Probably by the time we get done relating all these programs together, this bill might even come out intact, but my point is this: We have to review in context all of our overseas expenditures. AID comes out of the Foreign Affairs Committee. We need to put that into the pot. Public Law 480 comes out of the Agriculture Committee. Those are good programs. We have to coordinate them. The development banks come out of the Banking and Currency Committee. A couple of weeks ago we had the Export-Import Bank bill here, increasing its amount, and, incidentally, at the same time corrupting, as I pointed out, the Bank as a commercial bank and putting it into financing a lot of military items that are not commercial. This was done without the attempt of the House to coordinate these programs.

The fourth area is military aid, including troops abroad, which comes out of the Armed Services Committee. Of course, as I have mentioned, the Ways and Means Committee has jurisdiction over travel abroad, private investment abroad, and so forth. These are our programs. Each committee that does its work in this area can come forth and say, "These are good programs." But when we are talking about establishing priorities, it means rating good programs in relation to each other, and even cutting back on some good ones, so we will not be overextended.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that I made the effort on the floor of the House to take the Export-Import Bank out of the arms business.

Mr. CURTIS. I know the gentleman did. If he will recall, I was trying to backstop him. It was a valiant fight, but unfortunately we lost. That is all the more reason why I think I would say this bill is untimely on the floor at this time. What needs to be done is for the leadership of the House on both sides of the aisle to get the ranking Members of the five committees I have mentioned, to get them together to talk in terms of all these various foreign commitments we have, to see what priorities we are going to establish.

I am repeating myself. I think if this

exercise were done, and I had anything to do with it, this bill before us would receive perhaps the highest priority—in my judgment, the highest except the private investment abroad, which I think is by far the best—but certainly of governmental programs, this would receive the highest priority.

But we have to do this kind of thing if we are to restore confidence in the United States, if we are to restore confidence that this country will be able to handle its own fiscal affairs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 minute.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to correct the record. The House Armed Services Committee has not had jurisdiction over military aid to foreign countries.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I beg to differ with the gentleman. There are some aspects they do not have jurisdiction over, but on troops abroad, they certainly do.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, the only thing our committee handles—I have been on this committee about 20 years.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman has been, but let me give an example. Just last week, when we had the Export-Import Bank bill for consideration, there was no question of the Armed Services Committee having jurisdiction over how to finance the sale of these military weapons abroad, and the committee has been doing this for years. On certain aspects of military aid, the committee does not have jurisdiction, but it does have over a big chunk of it.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I think if the gentleman will check the record, he will find it is untrue that the committee has jurisdiction over foreign military aid.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, the record is there. I am sorry the gentleman has exposed himself on this.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Brock].

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, I think most of the Members would agree with the gentleman from Missouri that we desperately need coordination.

I think the point that needs to be made on this particular bill is that there is no adverse impact on the budget. I personally feel there will be no adverse impact on the balance of payments. I think this bill is a necessary device to maintain our commitments, and I urge its approval.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss].

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge that this Committee give its approval to H.R. 15364 a bill "to provide for increased participation by the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank, and for other purposes." Action on this bill is to insure that the

hard loan operations of the Inter-American Development Bank can proceed in a sound and orderly fashion over the next 3 years and at a level consonant with the objectives of the Alliance for Progress.

Although this bill involves no immediate or, indeed, foreseeable expenditure of U.S. Government funds it is, nevertheless, crucial to the acceleration of economic and social development in our sister Republics of this hemisphere.

The bill would reinforce the lending powers of the Inter-American Development Bank—the IDB—which has been known as the Bank of the Alliance for Progress. It would do this by permitting the Secretary of the Treasury, as U.S. Governor of the Bank, to subscribe to our share of a \$1 billion increase in the Bank's authorized callable ordinary capital. The Latin American members of the IDB, in the spirit of cooperative effort which the IDB has done so much to help generate, will themselves be subscribing to their fair share of this increase in the Bank's callable capital.

This U.S. share of the increased callable capital stock of the Bank would amount to \$411,760,000 to be subscribed in two equal portions of \$205,880,000 each. Callable capital subscriptions of the Bank are contingent liabilities of member governments that serve as guarantees which enable the Bank to borrow in private capital markets. As contingent liabilities, they involve no cash outlay unless needed to meet obligations issued or guaranteed by the Bank. U.S. subscriptions to the callable capital of the IDB previously approved by the Congress have not been the subject of calls and, because of the sound and prudent banking basis on which the IDB has conducted its affairs, it is unlikely that there would be calls on these subscriptions.

The Inter-American Development Bank is a going institution in which the United States and the nations of Latin America work together closely and productively. The Banking and Currency Committee and the Congress may justly be proud of the IDB and of its record. In 1959, on the recommendation of your Banking and Currency Committee, the Congress approved U.S. membership in this Bank—an action which was taken with broad bipartisan support.

On three separate legislative occasions since then, the committee has recommended and Congress has approved authorizations for replenishing both the hard and soft loan resources of the Bank. With this support from the United States, and with the resources contributed and the self-help measures taken by the Latin American countries who are the recipients of IDB loans, the Bank has made a major contribution to the economic development of South and Central America. Its \$2.3 billion of loans of all types, more than matched by financial inputs by the borrowers, have made a very substantial and tangible contribution to stability and progress in the hemisphere.

Today's bill is identical in amount and purpose to the increase in the U.S. subscription to the callable ordinary capital stock of the Inter-American Develop-

ment Bank approved by the Congress in 1964 by Public Law 88-259. Now that the Bank's original paid-in capital has been fully committed, the principal source of funds for financing the Bank's hard loan operations consists of borrowings in the private capital markets of developed countries, including the United States and Europe. These borrowings are made possible by the guarantee to lenders that exists in the form of the U.S. subscription to the Bank's callable capital stock.

When the Bank was established in 1959 it had initial authorized ordinary capital stock of \$850 million equivalent, comprised of \$400 million of paid-in shares and \$450 million in callable shares. Of this original callable capital stock, the United States subscribed \$200 million and the Latin American members of the Bank subscribed the equivalent of \$231 million. The difference between the sum of these two amounts and the original authorized callable capital stock of \$450 million represented the share intended in 1959 for Cuba. The Castro regime did not, however, join the Bank at that time and Cuba is now no longer eligible to become a member of the Bank.

Under the able leadership of its President, Dr. Felipe Herrera, of Chile, the Bank's ordinary capital lending and borrowing operations have grown at a very satisfactory rate. Its first borrowing operation based on its callable capital took place in 1962. By 1964 we in the Congress recognized that maintenance of an adequate growth rate for the Bank necessitated additional callable capital stock to permit the continued borrowings needed to underlie ordinary capital lending activity. In that year, the Bank's authorized callable capital stock was increased by the equivalent of \$1 billion, of which the U.S. share was \$412 million—the same amount being sought under this bill. This \$1 billion increase in 1964, together with an increase of \$300 million of shares to be reserved for subscription by possible new members, brought the Bank's total authorized capital to \$2,150,000,000. The pending increase would raise this amount to \$3,150,000,000 and bring U.S. involvement in the ordinary capital stock of the Bank to \$150 million paid in and \$1,024 million of callable capital. As I have already indicated, none of the callable capital ordinary capital stock subscribed to by the United States to date has had to be paid to the Bank and it has remained as a book entry in Treasury Department accounts.

H.R. 15364 would do three things:

First, it would authorize the Secretary of the Treasury as U.S. Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank to vote in favor of an increase in the authorized callable capital stock of the Bank under article II, section 2 of the agreement as recommended by the Board of Executive Directors in its report of April 1967, to the Board of Governors of the Bank.

Second, it would authorize the U.S. Governor of the Bank to agree, on behalf of the United States, to subscribe to its proportionate share of the \$1 billion increase in the authorized callable ordinary capital stock of the Bank.

Third, it would authorize appropriate

tion, without fiscal year limitation, for payment by the Secretary of the Treasury of the increased U.S. subscription to the authorized callable ordinary capital stock of the Bank.

These actions are both desirable and necessary if the Inter-American Development Bank is to continue to play its vital and dynamic role in advancing Latin American economic and social development within the framework of the Alliance for Progress. These actions are desirable and necessary if the Bank is to fulfill the new and challenging responsibilities—especially in the field of financing multinational regional integration projects—it was given in the Declaration of the Presidents of America, signed at Punta del Este, Uruguay, in April last year. It is of the utmost importance to the United States and to the Latin American members of the Alliance for Progress that the Inter-American Development Bank have access to sufficient financial resources to meet its responsibilities—and this is particularly important during the next decade when the Latin American nations will be moving forward, vigorously and confidently, with the creation of the Latin American Common Market which is to be a foundation stone for the erection of a sound, outward-looking, progressive, and prosperous hemispheric economic system.

The presently available ordinary capital resources of the Bank will, according to the best estimates, be exhausted by late this year at the desired rate of lending activity. The proposed U.S. subscription to roughly \$412 million of additional callable ordinary capital stock, which will be more than matched by Latin American callable ordinary capital stock, is essential to enable the Bank to carry out its mission in the Alliance for Progress.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to note briefly that the present bill involves an institution in which the Congress has had a long history of interest and which, reflective of the cooperative spirit of the Alliance for Progress, has a long record of sound management and cooperation with the United States. This Bank is an extraordinary investment for the U.S. taxpayer—under the present bill it is very unlikely that appropriated funds will ever be disbursed. The Bank is a key element in a key area of U.S. foreign policy—the successful Alliance for Progress. The Bank recognizes, and cooperates with, our balance-of-payments policies and programs. This is a sound Bank—with sound objectives—and this is a sound bill, meriting swift and affirmative action by the Congress.

There has been discussion in the last few minutes about the balance of payments, particularly by my friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], and I should like to walk through this problem with Members for a moment.

Let us look at our balance-of-payments deficit. Our current deficit, overall, last year was \$3.5 billion.

Our military deficit—the result of our troops in Europe, in Asia, and the rest of the world—was \$4.25 billion, more than the entire overall deficit. If we

take our conventional civilian nongovernmental accounts, our trade in and out, our investment in and out, our tourism in and out, we are in surplus. The trouble, purely and simply, is in our governmental military accounts.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. Is not the same argument applied against the imposition of the interest equalization tax, the restrictions of the Executive order restricting private investment abroad, and the so-called voluntary restrictions by the Federal Reserve on bank lending? These arguments are sound, and I agree with the gentleman, but if we are going ahead as the Government has restricting the private sector, all I say is, let us get all of these foreign spending programs, the good ones as well as the bad ones, investment and current, put them in a pot, and let us establish priorities.

Mr. REUSS. I could not agree with the gentleman more. The report of the Joint Economic Committee, made public this morning, shows it is the unanimous opinion of the Joint Economic Committee, on both sides of the aisle, that the proposed travel expenditure tax should not be enacted, that the controls on foreign investment should be repealed at the earliest possible time, and within the year, and that we should not impose autarchic restrictions on trade. So I could not agree with the gentleman more. But let us get the cause of our balance-of-payments deficit straight in our minds.

It is our swollen military expenditures overseas that are responsible for this situation, and to deal with those we must deal with those, and not with innocent bystanders, like the Alliance for Progress.

Mr. CURTIS. We have to put them all in together, but the gentleman will agree that we are overextended abroad, will he not?

Mr. REUSS. Absolutely.

Mr. CURTIS. So let us put them all together and see if we can get a set of priorities established for them.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join in support of H.R. 15364. We are all aware of the Inter-American Development Bank's outstanding record in its financing of economic and social development in the countries of Central and South America. I believe that there are few banks which can match this record—over \$2.3 billion of loans authorized in 448 loans during the past 7 years and in making these loans the Bank has helped to mobilize \$3 billion of additional development funds from local and other sources. There have been only two small defaults out of these 448 loans and in both cases, the borrowers were private enterprises and in both cases the Bank has instituted legal proceedings against the borrowers. It is expected that the Bank will be able to recover a substantial amount in these litigations. In the unlikely event it recovered nothing whatsoever, its losses would be less than \$10 million, which represents well under 1 percent of its total loan commitments. I might point out in this regard that there have been no defaults

on loans to member countries or agencies or political subdivisions thereof.

The purpose of the bill before us is a \$1 billion increase of the callable ordinary capital stock. At this point in time it should be emphasized that the callable capital of the Bank is a contingent liability of the member countries which can be called only and to the extent necessary to meet obligations of the Bank on securities which the Bank has issued for sale in the private financial markets or on guarantees which the Bank has made. Otherwise, there is no burden on the member governments or on taxpayers in the United States or in the Latin American countries. Calls cannot be exercised as a means of obtaining cash from governments to carry on normal loan operations.

On the strength of the contingent liability represented by the callable capital, which is in effect a guarantee of the member countries, the Bank has been able to go to the private capital markets in Europe and the United States and successfully place its own securities. The proceeds from these bond issues are then available to the Bank as additional capital for lending operations.

Since its inception in 1960, the Bank has borrowed in the capital markets of the United States, Italy, Germany, the United Kingdom, Switzerland, and Belgium. It has borrowed in Latin American member countries, Spain, and Israel through the sale of short-term bonds to their central banks. It has also borrowed from government agencies in Spain and Japan. The total of all these borrowings now outstanding is nearly \$515 million. Within present capital subscriptions, the maximum the Bank can borrow and have outstanding is \$611.8 million. This figure constitutes a limit because the Bank has covenanted with bondholders not to permit its net borrowings to exceed the U.S. share of the subscribed callable capital.

The Bank's bonds that are floated in the United States are rated AAA and are sold broadly to institutional investors. In fact, every issue has been oversubscribed.

I submit that this is a remarkable record for an institution such as the Inter-American Development Bank. I also submit that action on H.R. 15364 is desirable and needed now and is in the interests of the Bank, of the peoples of Latin America and, particularly, in the interests of the United States of America.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill to allow the United States to subscribe to an additional \$411 million worth of Inter-American Development Bank stock. Let me say right now—before I go any further—that I am not talking about sending cash out of the country, but merely about subscribing to more stock so that the Bank's borrowing and loanmaking authority can be increased. There is very little chance that these shares, once subscribed, will be called for cash payment—at least in the foreseeable future. Thus, this subscription should have no effect on the budget and no immediate effect on the balance of payments.

I want to make this point crystal clear:

No money is to be shipped to South America to buy this stock, nor is any increase required in the Federal budget. If either budgetary or balance-of-payment effects were involved, I would oppose this measure because as this Committee knows, I am no friend of the Great Society's domestic and global welfare spending, particularly amidst the present financial crisis.

The reason for this legislation is simple. If the Inter-American Development Bank can increase its authorized stock, then it can borrow more money and make more loans. I prefer this to sending more foreign aid dollars south of the border: we have already given enough handouts to the banana republics. I must prefer the regional development bank approach, because these banks mix local money with ours, and the South Americans are a little more careful with their own funds than with easy come, easy go foreign aid dollars. Given this local involvement, regional development banks are a much better way of assisting foreign economic development than straight handouts. Moreover, these banks make decisions based on familiarity with local problems rather than the long distance ignorance of our State Department.

No doubt you will all recall that the State Department was recently found to be using AID funds to ship expensive cocktail party foods to our high-living diplomatic corps; however, I can assure you that the Inter-American Development Bank runs a tighter ship. It has a good record.

As I noted earlier, the Inter-American Development Bank needs this additional stock in order to increase its borrowing and loanmaking power. Even though no money will be sent out of the United States by this stock purchase, there is another possible balance-of-payments problem. Consider, for example, the loss of dollars which could be involved if the Bank floats new loans in the United States. Thus, even though no dollars flow to South America to pay for the additional stock, the stock will enable the Bank to borrow money—conceivably in the United States—which could result in an outflow of dollars. However, the Inter-American Development Bank, because of the generous support which it has received from the United States, is committed to assisting us in our balance-of-payments problem. The Bank has promised that the proceeds of any bond issues floated in the United States will be left here until the end of 1969, and so it is only at this later date that our balance of payments can be even indirectly affected. It is also worth noting that in 1966 and 1967, only 43 percent of the money borrowed by the Bank—43 percent of \$250,000,000—was borrowed in the United States. In the future, the Bank has promised to try and raise an even larger percent of its money elsewhere. For this reason, I do not think that there will be any dangerous indirect impact on our balance of payments.

I urge the Committee to support this legislation enabling the Inter-American Development Bank to increase its loanmaking and loanmaking authority. The Bank has a good record, and to the ex-

tent that we can aid it without hurting our budget and balance of payments, we should do so.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the increased participation by the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank.

U.S. membership in the Inter-American Development Bank was authorized by Congress in 1959. The bill we are now considering will permit the U.S. Governor of the Bank to vote a total increase of \$1 billion in the callable capital stock of the Bank, and, if the increase is approved by the other members of the Bank to subscribe on behalf of the United States its proportionate share of the increase, \$411,760,000. Appropriations for the U.S. subscription would be requested in two equal installments, the first in 1968 and the second in 1970.

The ordinary capital resources of the Bank consist of paid-in capital and callable capital. Loans from these resources are repayable in the currency lent, on sound banking terms. The U.S. share of callable capital is now \$611.8 million, substantially less than one-half of the total callable capital of the Bank of \$1,750 million. The callable portion of each member's subscription is not available to the Bank for lending, but is a contingent liability of the member countries. It can be called only and to the extent necessary to meet obligations of the Bank on securities which the Bank has issued for sale in the private capital markets or on guarantees which the Bank has made. Except in this highly unlikely contingency, there will be no expenditure of U.S. appropriations for callable capital and accordingly no burden on the taxpayers of the United States. This reliance on the private capital market, with the guarantee of the member countries, has the further virtue of placing on the institution the discipline of the marketplace. The Bank's operations and actions are subject to the screening of the harshest judge of all—the individual investor.

The resources of the Bank also include special funds which are made available on concessional terms in areas of basic economic and social significance. Since it began its lending operations in 1961, the Bank, as of January 31, 1968, has authorized loans and other assistance totaling \$2,391 million—including 155 loans from its ordinary capital amounting to approximately \$900 million. In doing so, it has helped to mobilize an additional \$3 billion in development funds from local and other sources for carrying out the goals of the Alliance for Progress. When completed, the loans authorized by the Bank will result in the construction of 49 large industrial plants and some 3,000 small- and medium-sized plants; the irrigation or improvement of 6 million acres of farmland; the expansion of the electric power capacity by 4.5 million kilowatts; construction of more than 2,000 miles of main highways and 10,000 miles of access and farm-to-market roads; 3,000 water supply systems for the benefit of 40 million people; loans of more than \$100 million for 120 institutions of higher learning with an enrollment of 150,000 students; and con-

struction of some 300,000 houses through savings and loan systems and public housing programs.

The legislation before us will permit the United States to continue its participation, in partnership with the nations of Latin America, in the activities of the Inter-American Bank. The Bank has amply justified our participation by a sound record of performance in assisting the economic development process in the hemisphere. It deserves continued support by the Congress.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 15364

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Inter-American Development Bank Act (22 U.S.C. 283-283i) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 17. (a) The United States Governor of the Bank is hereby authorized (1) to vote for an increase in the authorized capital stock of the Bank under article II, section 2, of the agreement as recommended by the Board of Executive Directors in its report of April 1967, to the Board of Governors of the Bank; and (2) to agree on behalf of the United States to subscribe to its proportionate share of the \$1,000,000,000 increase in the authorized callable capital stock of the Bank.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 1, line 4, strike "2831" and insert "283m".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin what happens if we run into a world financial crisis. We have seen some of the earmarks of it very recently. Then what happens under this guarantee program, under which our taxpayers are so heavily involved and which you laud so highly here today?

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. REUSS. The guarantee program, in my judgment, would not be affected even if the world's money managers lacked the wit to keep the system in order. The guarantee is solely as to borrowings made by the Inter-American Development Bank, which are in turn secured by the kinds of investments that they make. Bear in mind, these are hard-window investments. These are not warm-hearted schools, healing hospitals, and generous agricultural products, but these are industrial investments and pay-off investments.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Wisconsin would not indict the foreign handout and soft loan program, would he? He has been voting for it.

Mr. REUSS. No. I am all for it. But I just say that we have to separate these bills today. We do not have a handout program today, but we have the hardest-headed banking operation that the gentleman from Iowa has ever seen.

Mr. GROSS. If we do get into a world

financial crisis, then what happens with this Inter-American Development Bank?

Mr. REUSS. Then we can thank our lucky stars that we passed this bill and, in addition to the other assets of the United States, that our hemisphere is economically strong as a result of this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Why, if we have to put up hundreds of millions of dollars, would we thank our lucky stars that we got involved in that sort of a situation?

Mr. REUSS. Because we do not put up the money.

Mr. GROSS. Why would any sane person say that? Why?

Mr. REUSS. I will assert that a majority of, and indeed the unanimous majority of, the House Committee on Banking and Currency is entirely compos mentis, and they all said that the most sensible kind of investment is for us to let the private bankers put their money into Latin America, and that is what this bill does. It is not the money of the U.S. taxpayers, but private investment capital. By building a strong hemisphere at no cost to the taxpayers of the United States, I cannot imagine a better shield and bulwark to an international crisis than that.

Mr. GROSS. Please do not take quite all of my time, because I might have to get out one of those little slips of paper in order to get a little more time.

The gentleman spoke of this great, wealthy country of ours a few moments ago. The gentleman realizes, does he not, that this Government has more debt than all of the rest of the governments of the world combined? Just how wealthy are we, anyway?

Mr. REUSS. Well we are the wealthiest country in the world. We have more improved real estate, more consumer goods, more capital goods, better scenery, more glorious feeder cattle in Iowa, than any country on the face of the globe.

Mr. GROSS. You failed to mention that wonderful thing known as the "gross national product."

Mr. REUSS. Our gross national product amounts to more than \$800 billion, which dwarfs the national debt. The ratio of the national debt to the gross national product is more favorable than it has been, as an historical fact, for the last generation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing more fallacious than the gross national product as a yardstick of our economic well-being.

Mr. REUSS. In my opinion, it is a very good yardstick. I cannot think of a better yardstick to use, related to the material wealth and welfare of mankind, than the total of goods and services that we produce.

Mr. GROSS. Far more accurate would be the yardstick of net national income.

Let me say to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss], that I fail to find anywhere in this report accompanying this bill, any indication that the occupant of the White House is for this bill, or for that matter, that anyone else in the administration is for this bill.

Mr. REUSS. Yes. Let me call the attention of the gentleman to page 2 of the report.

Mr. GROSS. Well, just permit me to finish the sentence.

If we cannot get the President or someone in the administration to say that they are for this bill, then perhaps we can get candidate KENNEDY or candidate MCCARTHY to state a position.

Mr. REUSS. I am sure that we can get them to do so.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to find somebody in the present administration to state that he is for this bill.

Mr. REUSS. Splendid. If the gentleman from Iowa will yield further, in response to the interrogation which has been propounded by the gentleman from Iowa, there is set forth, in black-letter type at page 30 of the hearings held upon this legislation, in a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, directed to the Honorable Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, the signature of Henry H. Fowler, Secretary of the Treasury, Chairman, National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Policies; of Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, Acting Secretary of State; of Alexander B. Trowbridge, Secretary of Commerce; of Harold F. Linder, President and Chairman of the Export-Import Bank of Washington; as well as of Andrew F. Brimmer, member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Gross was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. GROSS. Well, where are the usual departmental reports on this latest outpouring of the taxpayers' money?

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman is such an indefatigable reader of committee hearings and reports, I am sorry that the gentleman has not seen this in the committee hearings, but on February 24, 1968, as contained in the hearings held on this bill there is the following:

The National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Policies solemnly and completely endorse this measure.

Signed by Henry H. Fowler, Secretary of the Treasury; Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, Acting Secretary of State; Alexander B. Trowbridge, Secretary of Commerce; and Harold F. Linder, President and Chairman of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

Mr. GROSS. I do not care about that. You can read the letters which are addressed to your committee to your heart's content. We ordinary Members do not receive letters from the Secretary of the Treasury. Where in the report accompanying this bill do we find the endorsement?

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, if the gentleman will refer to page 31 of the hearings, the gentleman will find the special report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Policies on the proposed increase in the ordinary capital resources of the Inter-American Development Bank of February 1968.

Mr. GROSS. The report which I hold in my hand has only nine pages.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I have reference to the hearings which were made available to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, and the gentleman from Iowa will find this set forth in such detail that he will hear more about this Inter-American Development Bank than he ever wants to hear again.

Mr. GROSS. I hope that someday we can bring an end to this business of a bunch of Americans going over to New Delhi, or to Buenos Aires, or to some other cockeyed place around the world—Timbuktu, or Ouagadougou—and there sitting down with a group of foreigners and agreeing that the U.S. share of this fund or that fund, for the purpose of our participation therein, is going to be 41 percent or 70 percent. I hope we can summon the courage around here to someday say to the people of this country that Congress and only Congress will make these deals. Let us put an end to this business of a few individuals taking trips abroad and coming back to say to Congress that "we have been down there and a commitment was made, and now you have got to pick up the check."

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman that, while members of the Committee on Banking and Currency have gone to Buenos Aires, to the best of my knowledge none have gone to Timbuktu or Ouagadougou.

Mr. GROSS. Well, some of you do not have to go to Timbuktu, or any place else, in order to make a commitment of this kind. If you do not go Vice President HUMPHREY will be flying around, as he was when he flew over to Africa not so long ago, making commitments to pave roads, build dams, and so forth, at the expense of the American taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, President Johnson has put restrictions on American investors who seek to invest their money abroad. The citizens of this country have already been bilked out of some \$152 billion in various forms of foreign aid and we have been told for years that that was for the purpose of providing a climate abroad favorable for private investors.

Now we are told exactly the opposite and today we are being called on to dedicate another \$411 million to an international financing institution. This simply does not make sense and I am not going to put this obligation on the American people no matter how vivid the colors that are being used here today to paint this picture.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to carry on the colloquy a bit more on the priorities of our foreign spending. I pointed out the manner in which the administration has restricted private investment abroad. I have been pointing out, trying to, at any rate, for a number of years, that I felt that the Curtis corollary to Gresham's Law was operating on foreign spending. That corollary is; namely, that Government money drives out private money. The reason I want to get this program and these other Government spend-

ing programs and investment programs all together along with these private ones, is to take a look at priorities, where the Government, our Government, the Johnson administration, has restricted private investment abroad in a very serious way ever since the interest equalization tax, and now is moving in even further in its restrictions. At the same time, the same administration is before the Congress asking to expand its expenditure programs and its investment programs, here in the Inter-American Development Bank, and we are going to have the Asiatic Development Bank in for an increase. We already considered the increase for the Export-Import Bank.

Now, I do not favor carrying out this imbalance of increasing Government investment abroad in lieu of private. I happen to think private moneys are much better invested. They are under much greater disciplines, and therefore there is less impact on the balance of payments. Actually, this determines whether we will have a greater plus in our balance of payments. We have two pluses, balance of trade, our exports over our imports and from our investment abroad. Our income from our private investments abroad have exceeded the plow-back of investments. This is the area the Johnson administration has sought to restrict to cut back on the overextension of the United States expenditures abroad instead of in the governmental area.

So I am saying the timeliness of this particular bill is questionable. I believe it would be well for the House to recommit this bill to the committee and get together with these various committees that have jurisdiction over our various foreign spending programs, and let us establish priorities.

I will speak strongly for this particular one, because I believe it is among the best. Where I would like to see us cut in is on the AID program, which is so foolishly administered in so many respects, and certainly in many aspects of the military expenditures abroad, particularly our troops in Western Europe and elsewhere.

And then finally I would be asking Japan, for example—which only spends about 3 percent of its gross national product on defense because of its constitution, and probably just as well, but all the more reason Japan should be the ones who are putting up more in the Asiatic Development Bank along with other countries in Asia and assisting with the problem of the less developed countries, instead of the United States.

The U.S. Government is overextended, and now here is the time for the House of Representatives to demonstrate our understanding of this.

Put this bill aside, recommit it to the committee, and let us get on with the deliberations to find out how we can balance our international payments.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I presume the gentleman knows that under the President's message, 110 percent approximately of previous years' investments in underdeveloped countries will be permitted. The

countries of South America are considered underdeveloped countries.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further to the gentleman because the gentleman obviously has not been listening to the debate. I pointed out that that is exactly the type argument used for private investments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time only to clarify the colloquy that was had a minute ago with the gentleman from Missouri.

I got in touch with the House and Senate Armed Services Committees and they tell me that foreign military aid—which I thought was what the gentleman was talking about and aid under NATO—are not under the jurisdiction of those committees.

Of course, U.S. military authorities and soldiers abroad are under the jurisdiction of the House and Senate Armed Services Committees.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS. I was talking about that—and I think perhaps I was not clear. When I said "military aid and troops abroad," I was referring to our troops abroad and that is where the misunderstanding may have arisen.

Mr. BENNETT. When it comes to a question of our troops abroad that is under the House Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. CURTIS. That is correct.

Mr. BENNETT. But the operation of military aid is not under the House and Senate Armed Services Committees. I misunderstood what the gentleman was saying. Now we both understand each other so it is all right.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, you see what I was trying to do was to put it in context of the various committees that had jurisdiction over some aspects of our spending abroad and I was pointing out that our Armed Services Committees had jurisdiction over this aspect—and it is a sizable sum.

Mr. BENNETT. I understand. I just misunderstood the gentleman. I thought the gentleman was referring to foreign military aid as to which there is no jurisdiction either in the House or Senate Armed Services Committee.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time not to voice any opposition to the bill before us, but to ask a question or two for the purpose of clarification of the members of the committee.

You will all recall, I am sure, that in 1965 this Congress enacted legislation to exempt from the antitrust laws banking communities that voluntarily cooperated in limiting lending in foreign countries.

My question is this: If it is good for the U.S. Government to provide guarantees in this type of international banking operation, why then, is it bad for the

private banks of this Nation to make loans without limitations for development abroad, be it through approved programs that are involved here, or for any type of investment, whether it be industrial or otherwise, in a foreign country?

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. REUSS. The gentleman has asked a good question. The answer is very simple. It is good for the United States, by this legislation, to permit the private capital market to serve the needs of Latin America.

Equally, it is good for the private enterprise system of this country to make capital investments abroad in the developing areas of Latin America and elsewhere. That is why there is an exception written right into our interest equalization tax, and voluntary controls and mandatory controls of capital investments abroad. It is not only to save but to encourage private capital investments abroad.

The gentleman is right, but the prohibition is simply not there.

Mr. COLLIER. The gentleman knows, of course, that this is an exemption which was necessary because there was indeed a question of violation of the antitrust laws if members of the banking community got together—had agreed to limiting the amounts of funds from the private sector for investment abroad. It became necessary because of the possible interpretation of the antitrust laws to enact this legislation, which the Congress passed. The result of it was to permit the banking community to get together in what otherwise would normally be a violation of the antitrust laws and agree to limitations with regard to private capital to be made available for foreign loans.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I am happy to again yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. REUSS. Those limitations relate only to private capital investment in developed areas, such as Western Europe. I would go on to say that I think even there these limitations are an evil, albeit for the immediate present—perhaps a necessary one—but happily there were no limitations and are no limitations on private capital investment in the developing areas, and that is precisely the kind of area which this bill seeks to let the private capital market help.

Mr. COLLIER. Yes, but certainly the gentleman from Wisconsin knows that as long as this bill becomes fiscally feasible in that, as I understand, the Bank has had a wonderful record and has sustained no loss, then certainly under these conditions one would not suspect we would sustain any losses for such investments made in Western Europe, where in fact the very nature of the economy would dictate that it would be more successful than perhaps investments made in Latin-American nations. Is that not correct?

Mr. REUSS. I share the gentleman's feeling that the sooner we can once

again permit free American private investment everywhere in the world, including developed Western Europe, the better; specifically, as I said a moment ago, I hope within the year that will be permitted, because we "kill the goose that lays the golden egg" when we tell American private investors that they cannot invest abroad, because if they cease to invest abroad we will get no return back from them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. COLLIER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. COLLIER. I engaged in this colloquy, and I think it is meaningful, for one other reason: Inasmuch as the problem, and the critical problem of balance of payments has come up today, and when one reviews the actions taken now for the past 8 years, the four basic steps that have been taken thus far to deal with our growing serious balance of payments and the pending proposal to deal with it further through the imposition of taxes on American tourists abroad, I seriously doubt whether this Congress can accept at face value these recommendations because, after having accepted those recommendations of the past, we do indeed find ourselves in a far more critical position in our balance of payments than ever before in our history. I quite agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin in making the observation as he did that unless we get to the prime causes of this problem, primarily the military personnel abroad, we will never solve the problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

"(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, without fiscal year limitation, for payment by the Secretary of the Treasury of the increased United States subscription to the capital stock of the Inter-American Development Bank, \$411,760,000."

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments?

If not, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DELANEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 15364) to provide for increased participation by the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 1096, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CURTIS. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CURTIS moves to recommit the bill H.R. 15364 to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 126, nays 271, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 60]

YEAS—126

Abbott	Gardner	O'Neal, Ga.
Abernethy	Gathings	Passman
Adair	Goodling	Poff
Andrews, Ala.	Gross	Pollock
Ashbrook	Gurney	Price, Tex.
Ashmore	Haley	Pryor
Baring	Hall	Quillen
Battin	Hammer-	Randall
Beicher	schmidt	Rarick
Bell	Hansen, Idaho	Reid, Ill.
Berry	Harrison	Reifel
Blanton	Harsha	Roberts
Bow	Henderson	Rogers, Fla.
Bray	Hull	Roudebush
Brinkley	Hutchinson	Rumsfeld
Broomfield	Ichord	Satterfield
Brown, Ohio	Jarman	Schadeberg
Broyhill, N.C.	Jonas	Scherle
Buchanan	Jones, Mo.	Schneebeli
Burke, Fla.	Jones, N.C.	Scott
Burleson	King, N.Y.	Shipley
Bush	Kleppe	Sikes
Byrnes, Wis.	Kornegay	Smith, Okla.
Carter	Kuykendall	Snyder
Chamberlain	Laird	Steiger, Ariz.
Clancy	Latta	Stratton
Conable	Lennon	Stuckey
Cunningham	Long, La.	Taylor
Curtis	Lukens	Thompson, Ga.
Denney	McClure	Thomson, Wis.
Devine	McCulloch	Tuck
Dickinson	McMillan	Utt
Dole	March	Waggonner
Dorn	Martin	Wampler
Dowdy	Miller, Ohio	Watkins
Downing	Mills	Watson
Duncan	Minshall	White
Edwards, Ala.	Montgomery	Whitener
Everett	Morton	Whitten
Flynt	Myers	Winn
Fountain	Natcher	Zion
Fulton, Tenn.	Nichols	
Fuqua	O'Konski	

NAYS—271

Adams	Bevill	Burton, Calif.
Addabbo	Blester	Button
Albert	Bingham	Byrne, Pa.
Anderson, Ill.	Blatnik	Cabell
Anderson,	Boland	Cahill
Tenn.	Bolling	Carey
Andrews,	Bolton	Casey
N. Dak.	Brademas	Cederberg
Annunzio	Brasco	Celler
Arendt	Brook	Clark
Ashley	Brooks	Clausen
Aspinall	Brotzman	Don H.
Ayres	Brown, Calif.	Clawson, Del
Barrett	Brown, Mich.	Cleveland
Bates	Broyhill, Va.	Cohelan
Bennett	Burke, Mass.	Collier

Colmer	Hosmer	Price, Ill.
Conte	Howard	Pucinski
Corbett	Hungate	Quile
Corman	Hunt	Rallsback
Cramer	Irwin	Rees
Culver	Jacobs	Reid, N.Y.
Daddario	Joelson	Reinecke
Daniels	Johnson, Calif.	Reuss
Davis, Wis.	Johnson, Pa.	Rhodes, Ariz.
Dawson	Jones, Ala.	Rhodes, Pa.
de la Garza	Karsten	Riegle
Delaney	Karth	Rivers
Dellenback	Kastenmeyer	Robison
Dent	Kazen	Rodino
Dingell	Kee	Rogers, Colo.
Donohue	Keith	Ronan
Dow	Kelly	Rooney, N.Y.
Dulski	Kirwan	Rooney, Pa.
Dwyer	Kluczynski	Rosenthal
Eckhardt	Kupferman	Rostenkowski
Edmondson	Kyl	Roush
Edwards, La.	Kyros	Roybal
Ellberg	Langen	Ruppe
Erlenborn	Leggett	Ryan
Esch	Lipscomb	St Germain
Eshleman	Lloyd	Sandman
Evans, Colo.	Long, Md.	Saylor
Evins, Tenn.	McCarthy	Scheuer
Fallon	McClary	Schweiker
Farbstein	McCloskey	Schwengel
Fascell	McDade	Sisk
Feighan	McDonald,	Slack
Fino	Mich.	Smith, Calif.
Fisher	McFall	Smith, Iowa
Flood	Macdonald,	Smith, N.Y.
Foley	Mass.	Springer
Ford, Gerald R.	MacGregor	Stafford
Ford,	Machen	Staggers
William D.	Madden	Stanton
Fraser	Mahon	Steed
Frelinghuysen	Mailliard	Steiger, Wis.
Friedel	Mathias, Calif.	Stephens
Fulton, Pa.	Mathias, Md.	Sullivan
Gallifanakis	May	Taft
Gallagher	Mayne	Talcott
Garmatz	Meeds	Teague, Calif.
Gettys	Meskill	Teague, Tex.
Glaimo	Minish	Tenzer
Gibbons	Mink	Thompson, N.J.
Gilbert	Mize	Tiernen
Gonzalez	Monagan	Udall
Goodell	Morgan	Ullman
Gray	Morris, N. Mex.	Van Deerlin
Green, Oreg.	Morse, Mass.	Vander Jagt
Green, Pa.	Moss	Vanik
Griffin	Murphy, Ill.	Vigorito
Griffiths	Murphy, N.Y.	Waldie
Grover	Nedzi	Walker
Gubser	Nelsen	Whalen
Gude	O'Hara, Ill.	Whalley
Halpern	O'Hara, Mich.	Widnall
Hamilton	Olsen	Wiggins
Hanley	O'Neill, Mass.	Williams, Pa.
Hanna	Ottlinger	Willis
Hansen, Wash.	Patman	Wilson, Bob
Hardy	Patten	Wilson,
Harvey	Pelly	Charles H.
Hathaway	Pepper	Wolf
Hawkins	Perkins	Wright
Hays	Pettis	Wyatt
Hebert	Philbin	Wyder
Hechler, W. Va.	Pickle	Wyman
Heckler, Mass.	Pike	Yates
Helstoski	Pirnie	Young
Hicks	Poage	Zablocki
Hollifield	Podell	Zwack
Horton	Pool	

NOT VOTING—36

Betts	Halleck	Nix
Blackburn	Herlong	Purcell
Boggs	Holland	Resnick
Burton, Utah	King, Calif.	Roth
Conyers	Landrum	St. Onge
Cowger	McEwen	Selden
Davis, Ga.	Matsunaga	Shriver
Derwinski	Michel	Skubitz
Diggs	Miller, Calif.	Stubblefield
Edwards, Calif.	Moore	Tunney
Findley	Moorhead	Watts
Hagan	Mosher	Wylie

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. King of California with Mr. Mosher.
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Betts.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Skubitz.

Mr. Watts with Mr. Burton of Utah.
Mr. Selden with Mr. Findley.
Mr. Hagan with Mr. Moore.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Roth.
Mr. Holland with Mr. Shriver.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Wylie.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Blackburn.
Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Resnick with Mr. Nix.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Diggs.

Mr. McMILLAN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SUPPORT FOR THE LEADER OF OUR NATION AND PARTY: LYNDON B. JOHNSON

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to go on record today on where I stand on the matter of Democratic Party leadership.

I support President Lyndon B. Johnson for reelection in 1968. And I urge all Democrats to join with me in continuing to support a President who has earned the right to affection and respect.

I am proud to support a President who has kept more than 90 percent of the campaign pledges he made 4 years ago to the American people, a President who has led the way to unprecedented social welfare legislation—landmark programs in education, health, civil rights, and the war on poverty.

I am proud to support a President who has provided the kind of leadership that resulted in a period of uninterrupted economic prosperity. The record will show that by his urgings to the American people, we have determined to do something about urban decay, wasted human resources and the economic and social inequities in our midst.

I am well aware of what administration critics are saying about Vietnam.

But what are the alternatives to the administration policy. We have heard nothing substantive from his opponents in both parties. And the reason we have not heard any reasonable alternatives articulated is that this administration is following the best and most reasonable course in this complex situation.

No American wants this war to be con-

tinued. Unfortunately, Hanoi is not quite as impatient as we are. President Johnson cannot negotiate with himself. He cannot force the Communists to the peace table. Nor, may I add, has he taken the kind of desperate and dangerous escalatory steps that could expand the conflict and edge the world closer to world war III.

I know President Johnson. I have worked closely with him for many years. And I wholeheartedly concur with the late President Kennedy's view that Lyndon Johnson is superbly qualified to be President of the United States.

It is worth remembering that President Kennedy chose Lyndon Johnson as his Vice President because, as President Kennedy said, he wanted to protect the best interests of the Nation by having as his replacement the best man for the White House.

This was John F. Kennedy's judgment. Events since his tragic death have borne out the wisdom of his decision to make Lyndon Johnson his constitutional successor.

Today, 5 years later, Lyndon Johnson has earned the right to stand among the great Democratic Presidents of our time. For our President has displayed the courage to meet difficult international situations of a Wilson or a Truman; he has demonstrated the legislative accomplishments of a Roosevelt; and the social compassion of a John F. Kennedy.

We Democrats have an excellent candidate for President in 1968.

His name is Lyndon B. Johnson. And in January 1969, we will proudly assemble at the steps of the Capitol to attend his inaugural.

These are difficult and challenging days for us all. But let us remember that we have the leadership, the program, and the will to keep faith with the American people and to promote the best interests of the Nation we serve.

The Democratic Party, under the banner of President Johnson, shall stand before the American people in 1968 with a proud record of accomplishment. And the people, in fairness and commonsense, will give us the victory we have earned.

SUPPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the President.

Mr. Speaker, we can have only one President at a time and, in time of war or otherwise, we can have only one Commander in Chief. President Johnson has made an outstanding record as President of the United States. I do not mean to imply that I have supported all of his proposals and programs but that is beside the point. Not all Democrats, and certainly not all Republicans, have agreed with him at all times, but he has provided a magnificent leadership.

He needs and deserves the support of the American people in these days of crisis and in the coming days. Despite

the fact that this is a campaign year, the welfare of our country must be put above all other considerations.

The President has called for austerity as we confront decisions involving the war and the challenge to the dollar and our economic security. I applaud this further move toward facing up to our problems at home and abroad.

Of course, I support the President as the leader of the Democratic Party and at the proper time I shall advocate his reelection, but my objective in rising today is to support him as President of the United States and Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces. There will be abundant time later to consider political matters. The welfare of the country must take precedence over partisan considerations and all other lesser issues.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the distinguished majority leader from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] and the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] upon their statements here today and say that I thoroughly agree with their every word. We have the hardest working, competent President, Lyndon B. Johnson, and we are going to reelect him in November.

BACKING UP L. B. J.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with the majority leader and my colleagues in voicing my support for our President, Lyndon B. Johnson, and his continued efforts to construct a peaceful world, to find self-determination for the people of South Vietnam, to contain China, and to arrive at some peaceful coexistence with the Soviet Union. There are those who ask for negotiation and for painful compromise. The President has asked for negotiation, and he can get none. I suspect that painful compromise means painful for the South Vietnamese people but not for Ho Chi Minh. I wonder if those who ask for painful compromise would consider the remarks made by a newsman here in the Capitol who had recently come from Vietnam in which he said that Ho Chi Minh wants no part of a one-man one-vote settlement in South Vietnam, because the vote would only be 15 percent in favor of the Vietcong. He said this was the commonly accepted percentage that the Vietcong would get in any free vote in South Vietnam. So I feel that the President should be supported and permit the South Vietnamese to achieve their self-determination and let them vote for their own government. Let the Vietcong have their 15 percent obtained without force and their terror tactics and not some sort of coalition which would provide them with a predeter-

mined Vietcong participation in advance; a coalition which to Ho Chi Minh means our surrender and immediate withdrawal and Communist control of South Vietnam.

SUPPORT THE PRESIDENT IN THE TIME OF MILITARY CRISIS

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I am prouder than ever of our distinguished majority leader, the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the remarks that the gentleman from Oklahoma has made today in support of the President of the United States. I am proud to be associated with Members from New York to California in this expression on the floor of the House today, an expression of confidence that we have a great leader in our President, that this Nation will be wise, Mr. Speaker, both at the Democrat Convention and in the national elections, to recognize the great leadership qualities of the President of the United States, and to continue him at the helm of our ship of state.

It may or may not be significant, Mr. Speaker, that among men who have served our country in time of war, men who have fought on the many battlefields, who have fought in the air, and who have fought on the seas, we find a great body of support for our Commander in Chief today. Many of us were in attendance at the ceremonies when the Veterans of Foreign Wars honored the Congress of the United States, and I do not think there was a man present who was not impressed that night by the great demonstration of support and understanding which came from the Veterans of Foreign Wars in behalf of the President of the United States.

Later today, Mr. Speaker, I shall place into the RECORD a resolution adopted by the national executive committee of the Disabled American Veterans, an organization uniquely qualified in my opinion to pass judgment on the merits of our Commander in Chief.

Mr. Speaker, it is further significant to me that this outstanding committee has firmly gone on record in support of the Commander in Chief and in support of his efforts to win the war against the Communist aggression and the attempt to enslave the people of South Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, it is my further opinion that the people of the United States of America appreciate demonstrated qualities of leadership and the substance of leadership, and will be more interested in that in November than in Madison Avenue merchandising or imagemaking in the selection of their President.

SUPPORT FOR THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to endorse what has been said here today, by our great Majority Leader CARL ALBERT and other prominent Democrats, in support of President Lyndon B. Johnson. I endorse what has been said in favor of his nomination for President and his election for another 4-year term in November.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe any President of the United States has been so successful in achieving his promises when he was elected to the office as President of the United States than President Lyndon B. Johnson.

Mr. Speaker, if we were to compare, or attempt to compare, President Johnson's record of achievements, a record which represents many achievements—I will say that we could not do that very well when making that comparison based upon just one former President, of the United States. In other words, we would have to compare his record in many instances and in a great many major instances with all of the former Presidents of the United States. If this were done, one would find that in some instances his record is much better than that of other Presidents who have preceded him in the occupancy of that Office. We have always had in my opinion outstanding and dedicated Presidents, however, Mr. Speaker, through the efforts of President Lyndon B. Johnson in the field of education, for instance, more has been accomplished in the recent past than has been accomplished in the entire history of the United States of America under all other Presidents; more has been accomplished to extend needed help to the poor and to the low-income groups, as well as in the field of hospital care, medical care, and achievements in bringing into being a wonderful program for the benefit of all the people and especially the plain people of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to endorse what has been said about his reelection.

PRESIDENT LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I want to go on record at this point in endorsing everything that has been said concerning our great President, Lyndon Baines Johnson. I am one who feels that it is time for the American public to stand up and be counted on whether or not he is doing the job that he should do, and whether or not some of these Johnny-come-latelies who flip-flop from one side to the other are the kind of candidate we want for President.

My Democratic colleagues might well keep in mind the fact that no President

has accomplished so much in the field of human welfare as has President Johnson. To deny him the opportunity to continue advancing his program might, and probably would, result in slow strangulation of what already has been accomplished.

The constituents of Democratic Members have benefited extensively from President Johnson's programs. Certainly it would not be realistic to expect these benefits to continue under a President of another political party that consistently has shown little regard for the welfare of the little people of this Nation. Nor could it be expected that they would continue under a different Democratic President. Those who would seek to deny Lyndon Johnson his party's nomination have not always demonstrated the same concern for the little people as has President Johnson.

There are many who are not in full agreement with the President's policies in Vietnam. Yet, as our distinguished majority leader noted, the President cannot negotiate with himself; he cannot force the Communists to come to the peace table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken may revise and extend their remarks, and that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this subject of our great President, Lyndon Baines Johnson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri object to that request?

Mr. HALL. I do, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman object to my requesting permission that all Members who have spoken on this subject may revise and extend their remarks?

Mr. HALL. I would not. That is quite all right, but I believe that all Members should walk down the sawdust trail if they want to join the bandwagon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PRESIDENT LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I believe our colleague from Missouri is correct—we should be willing to walk down the sawdust trail, and I am pleased to associate myself with the remarks that have been made here today because it seems to me that at this time, when the President is beset from every quarter, the people of America should think carefully about

who they want to be their President from now until November, and who they want to be our President after that.

I believe President Johnson has been doing a magnificent job as our leader. Again I say to our colleague from Missouri—we should walk down the sawdust trail, and it is a special pleasure to say this to the gentleman from Missouri, because the State of Missouri once gave us a real President, President Harry Truman, and at that time many did not wish to walk the sawdust trail for him.

Mr. HALL. I wish he was back.

Mr. IRWIN. I would say to the gentleman that I am afraid he might not recognize President Truman's great qualities if he were here leading us today.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

SUPPORT FOR PRESIDENT JOHNSON

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the majority leader for his forthright expression of support for President Johnson. His accounting of the accomplishments of President Johnson and his enactment of over 90 percent of the Democratic program as it was enunciated at the Los Angeles convention of 1960 is a testimony to the leadership he has shown, not only to the Democratic Party and to the 87th, 88th, 89th, and 90th Congresses, but to the American people as well.

No man can quarrel with President Johnson's domestic accomplishments. They are unparalleled in the legislative annals of American history. Today America is faced with one of the greatest threats in the history of our democracy. We all know that in 1945 an intermittent cold and hot war was declared by Communist Russia and was joined in 1949 by Communist China. The threat in the Southeast Asia theater has met the same resolute action by the United States that the threat in the Northwest Pacific met in 1950.

President Johnson has been carrying out an American policy as enunciated and defined by President Truman, and supported by President Eisenhower and President Kennedy. No internationalist in my memory has done more to try and settle the differences that exist between East and West in Vietnam.

Hanoi has consistently refused to come to the bargaining table. Their support, both in military hardware and ideology, has come from Moscow and Peking. A settlement in this area could come at almost any time, if they will but respond to America's offers. President Johnson has taken virtually every initiative to bring all of these forces to the conference table. To this day they have seen fit not to respond. I feel that the President is the most qualified American to deal with

this threat and that his formula for a lasting, permanent, and honorable settlement is the only sound course of action.

I want to reassure him and to assure the American people that I support him in this endeavor.

CONGRESSMAN MCCARTHY SUPPORTS PRESIDENT JOHNSON

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, in light of the events of the past weekend, I wish to join with other Members of the House who earlier today expressed their support for President Johnson. Over the weekend I was home, and there was great consternation, as I suppose there was all over the country. However, it seems to me that most people in western New York, in Erie County and the Buffalo area, while they are gravely concerned about the crises confronting our country and want peace, as we all do, tend to be standing with the President of the United States in a time of difficulty. I would hope that we Democrats can get through this period between now and the primaries with at least some modicum of gentlemanliness and decorum, and, after it is all over, that we will be united. And, finally, I express the hope that after the November elections the whole country will be united. For I am afraid that our adversary is not going to come to the conference table until he sees that the United States is united and determined to see this tragic conflict through to an honorable conclusion.

FOR BIPARTISANSHIP ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to an excellent editorial which appeared in yesterday's Philadelphia Inquirer and I ask unanimous consent to insert it at this point in the RECORD.

While the civil rights bill which recently passed the Senate does not go as far as I would like, nonetheless, it was a tremendous step forward in view of the special filibuster problems which face the other body. It will be a tragedy indeed if the House does not pass the Senate bill as is without delay. Any attempt to amend the bill or send it to conference would clearly make the bill a target for another filibuster in the Senate and its future would be in grave doubt. To adopt the Senate bill without change requires

solid bipartisan support in the House. I wholeheartedly agree with the editorial's closing paragraph:

Human dignity should be above partisanship. There should be bipartisan effort to enact, this year, a civil rights bill worthy of the American people.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Mar. 18, 1968]

FOR BIPARTISANSHIP ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Even in an election year there ought to be agreement among Democrats and Republicans in Congress on such fundamental matters as equal opportunity and equal justice for all Americans.

Unfortunately, there are indications that some members of the House of Representatives may be inclined to play politics with the civil rights bill approved by the Senate last week. Talk is centering on amendments to the bill which might have the net result of blocking enactment this year.

There is nothing basically wrong with proposing amendments to any bill, if the purpose is to improve it. However, amendments for the purpose of stalling or defeating legislation are another matter entirely. Congressmen who do not want to stand up and be counted on the open housing issue, in an election year, would like to ensnare the measure in some sort of parliamentary deadlock so they could avoid the question for now.

Tinkering with the Senate bill—not to improve it, but to delay it—would be an unwarranted and ill-timed frustration of efforts for genuine civil rights progress. Amendments would risk prolonged stalemate in a House-Senate conference committee, or another filibuster in the Senate. Four roll calls were required in the Senate this month to invoke cloture by the narrowest of margins, and break a seven-week filibuster against the civil rights bill. Another filibuster, late in the session, might be harder to halt.

The open housing section of the civil rights bill passed by the Senate is substantially weaker than the open housing law already in effect in Pennsylvania. Some Congressmen contend, nevertheless, that the open housing provision in the Senate bill should be watered down. Their line of reasoning is difficult to follow.

Human dignity should be above partisanship. There should be bipartisan effort to enact, this year, a civil rights bill worthy of the American people.

THIS IS A MODEL CITY

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, recently the Department of Housing and Urban Development designated Butte and Helena, Mont., as model cities. The mayors, the local committees, and, of course, the entire Montana congressional delegation were pleased with and grateful for this designation.

All Members of this body who have had cities in their districts approved for model city planning funds are certainly well aware of the tremendous local effort which is needed in preparing the necessarily comprehensive applications. The goal which we have won—and no

other district in the Nation has received two model cities designations—represents the success that can be achieved when local and Federal officials work closely together. This is a tribute to cooperation.

But, Mr. Speaker, model city designation is not really the goal; it is just the beginning. I am very pleased to see this realization reflected among the local committees and in the press in my district. The groundwork has been laid but everyone involved knows that ours must be a continuing effort until the day when Butte and Helena are, indeed, model cities.

I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an excellent editorial which appeared March 14 in the *Helena Independent Record*. It reports far better than I could the tremendous enthusiasm and the aspirations which are so evident in these fine communities. Butte and Helena know the opportunity which is now theirs and this outstanding editorial is an example of the splendid community spirit which assures that the final, important goal will be won.

The editorial follows:

AN ENCOURAGING START

The turnout at Monday's meeting of the Model Cities Committee was encouraging in terms of numbers (about 70) and in the community leaders represented.

Most encouraging was the spirit. There was no letdown after victory, no feeling of, okay, we got our designation, now we can relax. Instead, it was, okay, we've got our designation, the big job is ahead.

There was recognition, too, that there will be some opposition in Helena to the Model Cities program which must go to a vote of the people once the plans are completed.

The opposition is likely to come from two main sources:

Persons who are against using federal funds to improve the city. (Model Cities provides up to 80 per cent federal participation in urban renewal and other programs.)

Persons who, possibly for selfish, possibly for esthetic, possibly for sentimental reasons, disapprove of the final plans.

Vern Coughlin, chairman of the Model Cities Committee, made it clear at Monday's meeting that his committee wants full community participation in developing the plans, not only with respect to urban renewal but for the social, cultural and historical phases of the Model Cities program as well.

Certainly it will be necessary to hire professional help, Coughlin said, but "what we say we want to do with our community counts the most." This planning phase, he pointed out, "is where the people of Helena will have the most to say."

To those who object to the use of federal funds, Coughlin issued this invitation: "I say to them that if they want to join in and show where private endeavor can replace federal funds, I'm all for them."

After all, he explained, the over-all objective of the Model Cities and urban renewal programs is to encourage private capital to re-invest in abandoned and deteriorating neighborhoods. And it is working. In California, areas designated for urban renewal programs have seen private capital moving in ahead of federally financed projects.

The second group of potential opponents may be harder to define and harder to convince. There will be the guy who wants his property spared and the other who insists his be taken.

There will be those who insist on restoring some architectural monstrosity because of its dubious historical or esthetic value, even though it may be deteriorated beyond restoration.

There will be differences of opinion on the best future use for the areas now blighted, especially in this historic south gulch area.

We would say to these potential opponents:

Participate fully in the planning.

Participate with constructive imaginative ideas.

Participate with informed opinion, not fuzzy notions.

Participate in the spirit of what is best for Helena, not your personal fortune.

Think in terms of growth, for Helena is growing now and will grow faster as a Model City, and growth makes intelligent planning essential.

Then, once the over-all plan is completed, accept it as the consensus of what is best for Helena and support it with enthusiasm, even though you may disagree with portions of it.

Mayor Darryl Lee promised at Monday's meeting that the people of Helena will be kept completely informed, through the news media, of everything that goes on in the Model Cities program. This, too, is encouraging—and it is vital. When the plan goes on the ballot, the people must know what they are voting on and they must be convinced it is the best course for their city.

If the spirit shown so far is maintained, we're sure it will be.

MILK BONANZA EXCEPT TO CONSUMER, FARMER

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the farm editor of the *Springfield, Mo., Leader and Press*, Mr. Tom Ellis, has a long-standing and much-deserved reputation as a knowledgeable and articulate observer of the problems faced by the dairy farmer. For some time he has questioned the wide disparity between the profits of the dairy producer as opposed to those who process, distribute, and market his product. In the March 17, 1968, issue of the *Springfield Leader and Press*, he has articulated this question with a great deal of factual investigating and reporting.

A careful reading of the article shows that in the elaborate chain of milk pricing regulations, there is a missing link which protects everyone in the dairy industry against changing market conditions, except the farmer whose labor and risks are greater than anyone else's in the link between the cow and the consumer. I am calling this article to the attention of both the House Committee on Agriculture and the Secretary of Agriculture, but I think it is well that all Members of the House be aware of one of the major reasons why there is so much discontent on the farm today, I include the article, "Milk Bonanza Except to Consumer, Farmer" at this point in the Record:

[From the *Springfield (Mo.) Leader and Press*, Mar. 17, 1968]

MILK BONANZA EXCEPT TO CONSUMER, FARMER—FARM INCOME 2 CENTS LESS, BUYERS UP 6 CENTS IN YEAR

(By Tom A. Ellis)

Next Thursday at 1 p.m., an interim committee of the Missouri Legislature, comprised of an equal number of senators and

representatives, will open a hearing at Farmers Room of the Greene County Courthouse.

That committee was set up by the past session of the legislature to study the marketing of agricultural products of the state from farmer to consumer—to hear the gripes reaching all the way back from consumer to farmer.

Agriculture's contribution to the Springfield economy runs perhaps \$2.5 million a week, affecting not only farmers but town and city dwellers to tremendous extent. But a spokesman for the committee expressed some doubt consumers would be willing to attend.

One day this week, a reporter for these newspapers checked the milk display cabinet of one of the city's larger foodstores. Stepping it off, he measured the display case at 30 feet by 3.5 feet, give or take probably no more than inches; thus it occupied roughly 105 square feet of floor space.

Next, the newsmen counted the cartons and carton space—the counter was not quite full, seldom is because of the fast turnover of milk. The way it was stacked, the cabinet would hold 276 half-gallons of milk, and 80 full gallons. No count was made of the quarts, today a relatively inconsequential matter.

The half-gallons were selling for 59 cents, the gallons for \$1.15, about the same as for several months. The wholesale price of that milk in February, according to federal reports, was 50 cents a half-gallon, with no price listed for gallons. Because of cheaper packaging and handling, it is a safe assumption that wholesale prices on gallons is somewhat less, proportionately.

So the store clears 9 cents a half-gallon on milk? Wrong! It makes that plus other substantial benefits, including discounts.

There is nothing new in discounts for volume buying—and nothing wrong, probably. How high they range on milk is a carefully guarded secret, but in Springfield they are reputed to run 12 to 14 and even 16 percent—figures previously published and never denied.

Assume this store got 12 percent; on a 50-cent wholesale price per half-gallon of milk, that would knock off another 6 cents, reducing actual cost to 44 cents and giving the store a profit of 15 cents. That would be nearly a 34 percent profit on a commodity that turns regularly and fast.

If the discount were 14 percent, add another cent to the profit; 2 cents if it were 16 percent.

The markup on chocolate milk is probably slightly less, for it has sugar and chocolate added, but profit runs more on buttermilk and the so-called "health" (low butterfat) milk, and probably even higher on quarts.

But ignoring the quarts, that display case still held the equivalent of 266 gallons of milk. "It would be a poor day's business when the entire contents of the case didn't turn over at least twice in that store," a man who has been in the milk selling business in Springfield told the reporter.

But to be conservative—just as in using the 12 percent discount instead of a larger one—consider the turnover is 500 gallons a day, 360 days a year (if the store closes on holidays as most of them don't, except perhaps on Christmas). At this conservative rate that dairy case would be earning the store \$150 a day, \$1050 a week, or \$54,000 a year, in round figures.

Suppose the case of milk turns only once a day—still more than half the 500 gallons used hypothetically in this example and still a bonanza. However, another spokesman well versed in milk marketing, said the 500-gallon estimate was not high; some big markets "turn closer to 1000 gallons a day," he declared.

Of course, this isn't all profit. There is the use of 105 square feet of floor space, the cost of checkouts at the cash register plus managerial costs, rent or its equivalent, and taxes.

Even here, there are compensating factors. The store doesn't buy the equipment; the dairy does. It never bothers with stocking or re-stocking; the dairy does that, too, three or four times daily. Any spoilage is absorbed by the dairy that supplies the milk.

Nor is that all, the store also operates on capital supplied by the dairy. The store pays twice a month for what it has purchased in the past two weeks, and has the interest-free use of those accumulating dollars until the next bill-paying day.

No slight matter, either. If the mark-up of one-third of cost nets \$150 a day, then the wholesale price must be twice that: \$300 a day, or \$4500 for 15 days. That would average \$2250 a week of milk plant money which the store has the year around, free of interest.

And if the store is one of a chain of four or five or more doing business in Springfield, this thing begins to look like the real bonanza it is, with the cost of borrowing what it is today.

Figured on annual percentage, the earnings from milk sales would be dizzying, astronomical, incredible!

Remember, this same store may be glad to get an 8 percent markup on another commodity that doesn't turn a case a week.

Consumers may consider the farmer the villain in this case; his share of that half-gallon of milk the customer pays 59 cents for figured at just a fraction less than 20 cents for February production. It may seem unfair he made more than the store did.

Or it's possible the consumer sees something else: That he and the farmer have a common cause for complaint. However, those city dwellers seeking more material for gripes—just in case they plan to attend that legislative "gripe session" this week—will find no dearth of it.

A year ago, Springfieldians were paying 53 cents a half-gallon for milk. Now they are paying 59 cents—the result, milk plants explained, of two price hikes to farmers. In each case, stores increased the retail price by more than the wholesale price boost they took.

So, willing or not, consumers were helping area farmers. Or were they? Producers in the Springfield market got 2 cents a hundred pounds less for milk last month than they received a year ago.

Plants are careful to inform the public when prices go up; seldom consider it newsworthy when prices go back down.

Then where did that extra 6 cents you're paying go? A good question to ask your legislative probers.

Actually, farmers today are receiving just about the same price for milk they did 20 years ago—sometimes less. Yet, in those two decades, how often have milk prices to consumers advanced on the excuse farmers were being paid more?

Corner the retailer or the bottler and ask them about it. They'll tell you all their costs have gone up, and it's true—all except the cost of the raw commodity they process and sell. Doesn't it ever occur to anyone that costs of production go up for the farmer, too?

Viewing it another way: In February, according to the U.S. Agriculture Department's monthly report on milk marketing, there were only about a dozen cities in all America where a gallon of milk cost as much as in Springfield; only seven where the cost of a half-gallon was as high, and in only two cities—Lubbock, Tex., and Tucson, Ariz., was the retail markup as great.

Yet in the more than 70-odd federal milk marketings in the nation, only one other has a price as low or lower to farmers than the Springfield market.

In Springfield last month, plants paid about \$5.78 a hundred pounds for milk, including premiums, and consumers paid 59 cents a half-gallon; in Kansas City, plants paid \$6.05 and stores sold it at 43 to 49 cents a half-gallon. In Houston, Tex., for just one of many other contrasting examples, bottlers paid \$7.15; consumers, 54 cents a half-gallon.

Price-conscious local consumers, are quick to report on prices outside of Springfield. One called last week to say he had been in a Joplin store, one in a chain operating out of Springfield, and there found milk selling for 55 cents a half-gallon, the same brand as that store carries in Springfield. That milk was being hauled 70 miles and retailed 4 cents cheaper than to Springfieldians—home folks.

Another told of being in Parkville last month, in the store of "an old friend" when the day's delivery of milk was made. The Merchant gave the Springfieldian his sales slip for proof. The wholesale price was 37.5 cents a half-gallon (50 cents here), and milk retailed at 45 cents a half-gallon, three for \$1.29.

Merchants do sell "leader" items at a loss, but is it necessary to subsidize a Central American banana grower, a Brazilian coffee grower out of the pockets of Ozarkers, both farmers and consumers?

The Missouri Legislature, in its past regular session, entertained a bill intended to correct the inequities of milk marketing—one that would have protected the consumer.

It was killed in 10 days largely through the efforts of two national chains of stores. "Please, Mr. Legislator, Don't Raise the Price of My Baby's Milk!" wept full-page ads in the state's largest newspapers. Advertisers were thoughtful enough to provide the telephone numbers of legislators voters might contact to prevent this outrage against chain store profits.

The bill, which had been expected to pass, went down to defeat—but the price of "Baby's Milk" didn't go down a cent.

The fate of this bill almost certainly had something to do with the hearing scheduled here Thursday—and Friday, if enough consumers are interested to appear before it with their complaints. After all, they're the ones who pay their money; they're entitled to their choice.

THE "SPLENDID LITTLE WAR" AND A MAN WHO SERVED IN IT—HON. BARRATT O'HARA OF ILLINOIS

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, 70 years ago next month, on April 25, 1898, Congress declared the existence of a state of war with Spain. John Hay called it "a splendid little war," and many historians say it was the most far-reaching step in the history of our Republic. At the end of the war, 10 weeks later, we had acquired a colonial empire of 120,000 square miles and 8,500,000 people. The United States had attained the rank of world power, whose strength and potential had to be taken into account by the nations of the world.

One of our colleagues, the Honorable BARRATT O'HARA of Illinois, was part of all this and for some years has been the only Member of the U.S. Congress who served in the Spanish-American War. What years of destiny this man's life has spanned. Consider, for a moment, that his eyes that saw rifle smoke from the old black-powder Krags today see the contrails of jet planes flying 6 miles above the earth. He and his comrades in arms thrilled to the saga of the battleship *Oregon*, steaming at flank speed around

Cape Horn to join Admirals Sampson and Schley outside Havana Harbor—and today he accepts as commonplace the existence of guided missiles that span half the earth in 30 minutes.

In his service to his country, 70 years ago, he wore the same uniform as did William Jennings Bryan, who served as a National Guard colonel, and as Generals "Fighting Joe" Wheeler and Fitzhugh Lee, who just 30 years before had worn the gray of the Confederacy as they gallantly fought against the very same Army they were now to serve.

BARRATT O'HARA could tell us of men whose phrases and deeds have been enshrined forevermore in American history. Hobson, who sank the *Merrimack*; Lieutenant Rowan, who delivered the famous message to Garcia; Commodore Dewey's "You may fire when ready, Gridley!"; Captain Philip, of the battleship *Texas*, who admonished his men "Don't cheer, boys, the poor fellows are dying!"; and Teddy Roosevelt, that giant among men, who was to go from a colonelcy to the Presidency of the United States.

There are few left now to connect America in the late 1960's, the awesome bulwark of defense against aggression that it has become, with those days when our feet were irrevocably set on the road we have followed ever since. BARRATT O'HARA may be the last man still in public life who serves his people, his State and his country so well by his reminder to us of what we were and how we became what we are.

Abraham Lincoln said "we cannot escape history." We should not try; we should not turn our backs on our past: it is when we close our eyes to these things—and to these men, who were a part of it and whose voices are still loud and clear—that we begin to lose sight of our heritage and the sources of our greatness.

BARRATT O'HARA was an eyewitness to and part of this event in our history that had implications far beyond what anyone knew at the time. He saw and took part in deeds that led directly to making us what we are today. It was only 10 weeks, this war, yet without it the history of the world would have been far different.

Among us, today, and for his people, his State, and his country, he renders a service no other man can give: he is a constant reminder to us all not only of what we were, but what we have become, and how we have tried to fulfill the destiny that fate has thrust upon us.

WELFARE SYSTEM NEEDS REVISION

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, though we often hear the cry from the less compassionate that our Nation is progressively becoming more socialistic, the fact of the matter is that the United States uses less of its national wealth for the social welfare of its citi-

zens than other advanced, industrial nations and frequently less than many poor and developing nations.

While West Germany and Luxembourg use 17 percent and 16.8 percent respectively of their gross national product for social welfare measures, the United States uses only 7 percent.

It has long been my contention that the United States has not adequately met its overall social welfare obligations and, in particular, has failed to sufficiently care for our senior citizens.

A step in the right direction was realized when this Congress enacted the recent increase in social security benefits.

However, with respect to those senior citizens receiving public assistance we have danced the minuet. There simply was no increase in benefits in some States for those on public assistance as has been so eloquently pointed out in an editorial that appeared in the March 12 edition of the Providence Journal. The 13-percent increase, which was designed to bring benefits in line with the cost of living, has been deducted from the welfare checks of those receiving social security benefits.

Once again it appears to be a matter of conflicting State and Federal Government legislation: We give with one hand and take away with the other.

Under unanimous consent I insert the poignant article previously mentioned in the RECORD with the intent of making the Members of this House cognizant of the need for reform in our welfare system:

SOCIAL SECURITY DILEMMA

When is an increase in Social Security benefits not an increase? The answer is when the beneficiary also is receiving public assistance.

In Rhode Island and many other states, when the Social Security payments increased by 13 per cent this month, a corresponding amount was deducted from the welfare checks of those receiving the old age stipend, canceling out what was designed by Congress as a cost-of-living increase. The action was taken, said James H. Reilly, state public assistance administrator, because the state's welfare system provides that all sources of income for welfare recipients must be treated alike. If income received by one recipient is disregarded, he explained, then it must be disregarded for all.

The question of whether this is fair can be argued at length on both sides of the issue. Some say those who have earned Social Security benefits by their contributions to the plan over the years should not be penalized. On the other hand, it is argued, public assistance is designed to supplement the income of those in need, and favored treatment for some would be inconsistent with the policy of a single standard for all.

Federal law contains a "disregard" provision that has never been adopted in Rhode Island. It could be put into effect by the state Department of Social Welfare, disregarding \$7.50 of income regardless of the source, if the governor and attorney general approved. The department is known to be considering this step. It has been urged in the General Assembly. In our view it should be thoroughly explored.

The savings the state will realize by reducing payments to aged, disabled and blind persons who receive Social Security would be an ill-gotten gain at the expense of people unable to provide adequately for themselves. There seems good reason to adopt the \$7.50 "disregard" provision as a much fairer alternative. According to Mr. Reilly, to do so would cost the state an estimated \$300,000 in

addition to restoring the \$200,000 deducted from Social Security recipients.

The real issue is much larger than the present case might indicate to some. The real problem is national in scope and is based on the need for a major overhaul of the welfare system to provide some form of social insurance that would not leave hundreds of thousands of disadvantaged Americans with less than the minimum required for a decent existence. Until reforms are adopted by Congress, the inequities and inadequacies exemplified by the present Social Security dilemma will continue to plague those trying to administer the law and those forced by circumstance to depend upon it.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT ACTION PROGRAM FOR A STRONG U.S. MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, at a time when our merchant marine is playing a valiant role in connection with the logistical problems of the conflict in Vietnam, I commend for reading by Members of Congress a report issued by a joint labor-management committee on maritime affairs. It goes without saying that I endorse the findings of this labor-management committee and its 15-point program for an adequate American merchant marine.

The report follows:

FINDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE

"There is no dispute that our Merchant Marine is woefully inadequate. We are now carrying—and this is a startling figure—under 8 percent of our foreign waterborne trade. The United States has dropped to 16th in the world's shipbuilding statistics. While the world fleet increased by 61 percent in the last 15 years, America's privately owned fleet has decreased by 24.5 percent."

This deplorable condition must be corrected immediately. We must revitalize the U.S. Merchant Marine. Our national security, as well as our pressing domestic problems, characterized by the balance of payments situation, cry for action now.

THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

1. Thirty-five to forty new commercial ships a year.
2. Operating differential subsidy for non-berth vessels as well as liners for foreign trade, retaining the basic parity concept.
3. A positive program for the revitalization of passenger ship fleet.
4. An extension of tax deferred construction reserve fund to all American merchant and fishing vessels.
5. A more simplified system for determining construction-differential subsidy retaining parity as a basic concept of such support.
6. Research and development funds to revitalize the Merchant Marine and expand the cargo carrying capacity of U.S. ships, with full guarantees for jobs and security for the workers to be carried out.
7. Establishment of a quasi-judicial subsidy board.
8. Establishment of a revolving construction reserve fund to provide for continuing fund replenishment from customs receipts.
9. A fleet of nuclear powered vessels for foreign and domestic commerce.
10. The strengthening and full implementation of the Cargo Preference laws.

11. Opposition to the Department of Defense appropriation for the Fast Deployment Logistic Ships.

12. Support of reorganization plan to place the Maritime Administration in the Department of Transportation and Cargo Preference in Marad.

13. Support of measures (S. 2056 and S. 2087) to require U.S. citizens for replacements in foreign ports and eliminate abuses of provisional registry.

14. Support for the revitalization of the fish industry (bill to be introduced shortly).

15. The use of U.S. flag ships in greater numbers as a positive tool to help eliminate the U.S. dollar gap.

Maritime Labor-Management Unity

Committee; For labor: Joseph Curran, National Maritime Union; Thomas W. Gleason, International Longshoremen's Association; Jesse M. Calhoun, National Marine Engineers Beneficial Association; Lloyd Sheldon, International Association of Masters, Mates and Pilots; William J. Steinberg, American Radio Association; Carroll Armstrong, Great Lakes Seamen, Local 5000, United Steelworkers of America.

For management: Marinos Costeolos, Albatross Shipping; Manuel Diaz, American Export-Isbrandtsen Lines; Urban C. Ambrose, Blidberg Rothchild Co., Inc.; Erik F. Johnsen, Central Gulf Steamship Corp.; Fred L. Thielking, Clipper Marine Corp.; Ivo Matkovic, J. W. Elwell Co.; R. K. Riley, Farrell Lines, Inc.; Cliff Rowland, Grace Line, Inc.; E. V. Demson, Intercoastal Shipping and Trading; Frank A. Nemes, Lykes Bros. Steamship Co.; Eugene A. Yourch, Marine Transport Lines, Inc.; Captain J. B. Cecire, Moore-McCormack Lines, Inc.; Joseph G. Barkan, Prudential Lines, Inc.; Charles Nisi, Sperling Steamship and Trading Co.; J. K. Adams, States Marine Line; J. J. Malafronte, Transamerica Steamship Corp.; R. D. Carter, Transamerica Trailer; E. J. Heine, Jr., United States Lines Co.

A BROAD LOOK AT OUR FOREIGN POLICY

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, with the increasing tempo and tenor of the Vietnam debate here at home, two recent articles on Vietnam caught my attention—not only because of the challenges proposed, but for the reasoning contained therein. These assessments of the present Vietnam situation lend credence to the widely held views that alternatives to the policy now being pursued should be thoroughly and conscientiously explored. Dr. Edwin Reischauer's article, "A Broad Look at Our Foreign Policy," taken from the New York Times, March 10, 1968, and the editorial from Life magazine, March 15, 1968, follow:

[From the New York Times Magazine, Mar. 10, 1968]

A BROAD LOOK AT OUR ASIAN POLICY

(By Edwin O. Reischauer)

The Japanese continually talk about the *doronomia*—the quagmire—into which America has sunk in Vietnam. They remember that when they similarly sank into the *doronomia* of a guerrilla war against nationalistic inspired Chinese, the only road out led through total war and total defeat for Japan. The metaphor is not an unfamiliar one in this country. We are bogged down in a seem-

ingly endless and increasingly hopeless "dirty" war. In our frenzy to keep our heads above the engulfing muck, we have given little thought to where we should be trying to go, not just in Vietnam, but in Asia as a whole. Ostensibly we are still on the same course that led us into the Vietnamese swamp. But to continue in this direction will only compound our difficulties. On this point, I suspect that there is a growing, though unarticulated, consensus among hawks, doves, owls and the rest of us poor sparrows.

We seem to have lost our bearings and until we find them we can have little hope for a better future in our relationship with Asia. We must discover where there is firmer ground on which to stand and then head resolutely in that direction. Unless we do so, we may not find any way out of the Vietnamese *doronomy*, or, still worse, the route we choose, as in Japan's case, may lead to an even greater morass.

In recent weeks three widely separated and quite dissimilar events have underlined our need to take a broader look at our Asian problems. I am referring to the Vietcong attack on the cities of South Vietnam, the Pueblo incident off North Korea and London's announcement of the withdrawal of all British forces from east of Suez by 1971. All three were adverse to our immediate interests, but if they help us to lift our eyes from Vietnam to the larger problems, they could, in the long term, prove blessings in disguise.

It may still be too early to judge the full significance of the new stage of the war in Vietnam, but it seems probable that the psychological effects will outweigh the military. It may be, as some argue, that the increased intensity of the war and the heightened hopes of the Vietcong will make it difficult for them to subside back into a more passive, long-range, guerrilla strategy. In that sense, their options may have been reduced to fairly early and complete victory or a compromise settlement. It is even more likely that the drastic decline in the well-being and security of the urban population of South Vietnam has greatly diminished the chances that any Saigon regime can establish an effective government in the South as long as the fighting continues.

The psychological impact on Americans also has been heavy. Many have come to see what has been obvious for a long time to the more perceptive—that this is a war which America cannot really win. At the outset, it seemed possible that the Communist dissidents could be forced to go back underground, where in time, if all went well aboveground, they might wither away. But gradually it has become obvious that the best that could be hoped for was a compromise settlement far short of stated American objectives and dangerously susceptible to an eventual Communist take-over. Even this hope is now dimming, and there is a growing possibility that in the end the United States will be forced by the apathy of the Vietnamese and the incompetence of the Saigon leaders to settle for as dignified an exit from Vietnam as can be arranged.

But, however the war comes out, it has already been lost in terms of our original objectives. Our basic purpose, as often stated, was to prove that so-called "wars of national liberation" did not pay. The assumption was that, whatever the mix of internal revolution, external instigation and open aggression in Vietnam, a determined stand on our part could suppress it and would thus discourage the repetition of the story elsewhere.

Instead we have proved quite clearly to ourselves and everyone else that we cannot win a war like the one in Vietnam—at least at a price that would make the effort worthwhile. Vietnam has made it much more dubious than it was before that we would intervene strongly in a similar situation elsewhere in Asia and unthinkable that we would do so while the Vietnam war lasted. The

SEATO approach to the problems of Asia has been proved a failure. In other words, we are coming to the end of a policy.

Some Americans find it hard to accept this fact because they believe it can only mean disaster for Asia—and eventually the world. Assuming the failure of our thumb-in-the-dike operation in Vietnam, they expect the Communist wave to sweep over all of Asia. But is this correct? New "wars of national liberation" have not broken out, except for a small-scale insurgency in northeast Thailand which, while possibly in part a spill-over from the Vietnam war, is largely the product of local conditions. Smoldering Communist insurgencies have not flared up, except in the Philippines, where purely local misrule has given new life to old embers. Elsewhere in Asia, there has been no response to our failure in Vietnam. In fact, in Indonesia a powerful Communist movement has been crushed by nationalistic forces during these same years.

Basically, the success or failure of Communist movements in Asia is determined by internal conditions. With the one exception of North Korea, which was established in 1945 by Soviet military power, Communist movements in Asia have depended almost exclusively on internal forces and, where successful, have been carried along by nationalistic tides. In short, nationalism everywhere has proved to be a greater power than any other ideology or any external pressure.

Our concept of Communism as a great wave threatening to sweep over the dike we were desperately trying to build in Asia is quite false. Communism might be better compared to local ground water, and in most cases—one could cite Indonesia, Burma, Cambodia, India and many other countries—this ground water has not succeeded in undermining the local political structures. What we have been trying to do in Asia thus may be largely unnecessary—as well as impossible. Asian states do not need military dikes so much as good economic land fill.

The outstanding fact about the second event, the North Korean seizure of the *Pueblo*, is that the Administration's response was very sensible and cautious, and the cries of the hawks were surprisingly muted. Perhaps the lessons of Vietnam are not being lost on Americans.

But the *Pueblo* incident also has its own lesson. It shows once again that many Asians are not prepared to live by the rules of the game of international relations devised in the West. Even the Soviets have observed most of the rules and have tacitly developed new ones with us. The Chinese Communists and the North Koreans have repeatedly shown that they have only contempt for these Western rules. Other non-Western nations—and even some, like Cuba, which are part of Western culture—have done the same.

This is a fact of life that we must recognize. Lacking the means to force the rules on these countries at a price that would be worth the effort, we have to learn to live with the situation. This means a further limitation on the scope of our actions in Asia. The recent example showed that, while an unprotected American intelligence ship can safely operate 12 miles off a Soviet coast, just as their intelligence ships operate safely even closer to our ports and naval vessels, similar operations along the coasts of a country like North Korea can be undertaken only if we are prepared to provide strong defense support or run high risks. This is, of course, only a small and very specialized case, but it is illustrative of a broad category of military, diplomatic, economic and cultural activities in which our freedom of action toward Asian nations is severely limited by their refusal to accept our rules.

At this time when Americans are disturbed by the *Pueblo* incident and dazed by the blow-up in the Vietnamese cities, the

British announcement of complete withdrawal from Asia comes as a further blow. Painfully aware at last of the limitations of our power in Asia, we are appalled by the thought that the power vacuum in the Indian Ocean left by Britain's departure may have to be filled by us. To attempt to do so might stretch our power so thin and so overburden our economy and psyche that we collapse, as the Communists hopefully predict. Or, recoiling at the magnitude of the problems in Asia, we might decide to withdraw into "fortress America," psychologically and literally, leaving the rest of the world to stew in its own juices.

Either of these developments would be an unmitigated disaster for us and the whole world. Unfortunately, neither can be regarded as altogether unlikely in our present state of frenzied preoccupation with Vietnam and disregard of the bigger problems in our relations with Asia. Let us hope that these three successive shocks will, like cold water in the face, help us to clear our befuddled minds so that we can get our bearings in time.

We might start by examining the meaning of Britain's withdrawal. London has already taken its force of 10,000 men out of Aden and by the end of 1971 will have withdrawn a similar force from the Persian Gulf and more than 50,000 men from Singapore and Malaysia, closing down the great Singapore naval base. All that will remain of Britain's once predominant military power east of Suez will be a small internal security force of 6,000 Gurkhas in Hong Kong.

Will this British withdrawal result, as is so often predicted, in the creation of a power vacuum in the Indian Ocean? Only in a very relative sense. Seventy thousand men supported by only minor naval and air power constitute little real military strength in a huge area like the Indian Ocean, flanked by nations, from Indonesia through India and the Middle East to West Africa, with an aggregate population of around 900 million.

Twice British troops have helped quell violence in the tiny island of Mauritius—a task which even the United Nations might have been able to accomplish. One might argue that the absence of serious trouble in the oil-rich Persian Gulf, despite the general backwardness of the area and the survival of medieval sheikdoms on the southern shore can be attributed in part to the British presence. United Kingdom forces played a role in avoiding conflicts in certain former British territories, such as Kenya, Tanganyika, Uganda and Kuwait. They also helped contain the Indonesian confrontation with Malaysia, though Indonesia's own pathetic weakness and the presence of the American Seventh Fleet in the South China Sea were probably more important factors.

When it comes to the larger tasks, however, it is hard to see how the vestigial British presence in the Indian Ocean has made much difference. Certainly, forces of this size could not have suppressed any determined subversive movement in one of the larger countries. The British troops in Aden were not able to maintain tolerable levels of law and order even in that lightly populated area. The British presence had no great influence on the fighting between Pakistan and India. If Soviet aggressiveness needed deterrence in the Indian Ocean, this obviously was provided by factors other than the 70,000 British troops scattered around the area. If any external forces helped discourage Communist China from renewing its attack on India or invading Burma, it was the possibility of American intervention, not the presence of a thousand or more miles away of a handful of British soldiers.

In terms of major military forces, the Indian Ocean and the lands around its shores have constituted a power vacuum for some time. The withdrawing of the last few cubic centimeters of external military strength will not greatly change the situation, except

psychologically for Americans. We see ourselves standing all the more alone in our effort to preserve through military strength a stable and peaceful world.

It is a good time to ask ourselves some searching questions. The first might be: If the Indian Ocean area has managed to stay tolerably stable within a near power vacuum, may it not continue to do so in a complete power vacuum? Perhaps the rickety political and social structures of the region can stand more successfully without our heavy-booted military tread on their flimsy floors. Moreover, past experience elsewhere would suggest that the people of the area might be more likely to address themselves with success to renewing or repairing their political and social structures, if we were not so eager to mastermind the task for them. We should have learned enough from Vietnam to see how dangerous and futile it would be for us to undertake similar involvements even farther afield.

A broader question might be: What risks would we be taking in failing to replace the British in the Indian Ocean and how acceptable would these risks be? It would be foolishly complacent to assume that there would be no increase in the possibility of disturbances. Nor, in a rapidly evolving situation, could we presume that the past level of stability guaranteed the continuance of an equal level of stability in the future. There would obviously be risks, but it would seem safer to accept these than to try to counter them by an approach which has already proved hazardous and ineffective elsewhere. This is particularly true because in the whole Indian Ocean area the United States has few, if any, immediate national interests at stake.

The only great danger to us—and it would be a danger only over the long run—would be the establishment, by either the Soviet Union or China, of such effective control over large parts of this area that the dominating country greatly increased its own national power. But is this a real danger? Is it not merely a bad nightmare produced by our traumatic experiences in the early postwar years? If either the Chinese or Russians were such supermen that they could accomplish this sort of control in Asia despite the staggering obstacles of poverty, backwardness and violent nationalism, we mere mortals obviously could not compete with them anyway, and might as well make obscurity ourselves.

A more realistic American concern in this region—again in the long run—is its development in prosperity and stability as a healthy part of our shrinking globe. Increased warfare and internal stability would obviously disrupt this desirable development. If American involvement could eliminate these dangers, it would be a worthwhile effort to make, but the Vietnam example suggests that our efforts, far from stopping such disruptions, would be likely to make them even more destructive. And again the Vietnam example shows that our own involvement in attempting to keep the peace by military means sharply reduces our ability—or at least our willingness—to make contributions in the economic and technological fields, which in the long run are far more effective ways than military action to develop prosperity and stability.

It is also hard to see where specific, short-range American interests are much involved. The blocking of the Straits of Malacca would force the Japanese to make a big detour in their life line to their vital oil resources and some of their important markets. For the same reason, Suez is of particular interest to Europe, though the increasing size of tankers and falling costs of long-distance water transportation make even a reopened Suez of declining importance.

But the sea lanes through the area do not lead us anywhere. The resources and trade of the whole Indian Ocean region are not vital to the United States, and therefore their

denial through local warfare or internal instability would not seriously affect us. The impact on the Japanese economy would be much more serious, and even Western Europe would be discomfited, but not the United States.

Even for Japan and Western Europe it is only the oil of the Persian Gulf that is vitally important. The denial of this oil to the outside world, because of piracy, revolution or war, would entail financial losses to certain American companies, but these losses would be inconsequential compared with the costs to our nation of Vietnam-type military involvement. On the other hand, the Japanese economy might face disaster, and Europe would be sorely hurt. Close to a half of the energy resources on which the Japanese economy operates consist of Persian Gulf oil, while half of Europe's petroleum comes from the Middle Eastern area.

This situation suggests another fundamental question we should ponder: Why do Japanese and Western Europeans, who have very clear national interests at stake in the Indian Ocean area, look with equanimity—one might say complacency—on the prospects there, while Americans, who have no clear national interests at stake, feel that they face an agonizing decision? This paradox perhaps best illustrates what is basically wrong in our relationship with Asia.

World War II, from which we alone among the larger, advanced nations emerged relatively unscathed, left us widely extended around the world and burdened with heavy responsibilities. Our response to this challenge was on the whole wise and generous. But the abnormal postwar situation created in us habits of mind and response which have proved increasingly unsound. We have commonly exaggerated our immediate interests in Asia, the risk these interests faced, and our capacity to deal with them. As a consequence, we have tended to overreact.

Seeing us respond in this way, other countries, such as Japan and those of Western Europe, which have much greater interests in Asia and face far greater risks, have increasingly come to expect that in any situation the United States would do all that reasonably could be done—and very possibly more than was reasonable. Both we and they, thus, have come to assume that the United States unilaterally would undertake the responsibility for maintaining stability in Asia—and elsewhere throughout the world. The *Pax Britannica* of the 19th century was apparently being replaced by a *Pax Americana*.

The analogy is extremely misleading. This is no longer the 19th century. We live in a far more heavily populated, complex, highly integrated and power-crammed world. The explosive forces are far greater and the need for peace and stability far more urgent. The thin, selective system of the *Pax Britannica* would be entirely inadequate for the present situation. A guarantee of peace by a single nation—any nation—is even less realistic. In this age of intense national feelings, such an approach is doomed to failure. It breeds resistance among friends as well as foes.

Japan offers a good case in point. We have already seen that its national interests are far more deeply involved than are our own in the stability of the Indian Ocean area—particularly the Persian Gulf and the Straits of Malacca. The same is, of course, true of our comparative national interests in the stability of East and Southeast Asia. The countries of the area constitute important trading partners for Japan, but not for us—with the exception of Japan itself. The safety of the sea lanes that lead to Japan are a matter of life and death to the Japanese economy. A general collapse of peace in East Asia could drag Japan down, too.

Given this situation, it would be comical, if it were not so tragic, that most Japanese regard matters of defense and stability in East Asia as being peculiarly American prob-

lems, not Japanese. They feel that what is involved is American pride and an evil ambition to dominate the world. While valuing close contacts with the United States, with which Japan does about 30 per cent of its total trade, many Japanese fear too close an association. They regard American bases in Japan, not so much as valuable to Japan for the security and stability they provide to much of East Asia, but as detrimental to Japanese interests, because they might involve Japan in an American war with China.

In other words, Japanese have come to take for granted the benefits of the American presence and therefore tend to think only about the possible liabilities. They seem to assume that a senseless, driving ambition would keep the United States militarily involved in East Asia even without Japan's cooperation or the convenience of Japanese bases. It never occurs to them to worry about what might happen in their part of the world if the United States decided to draw back to mid-Pacific. Thus, the only problem that looms in their minds is the danger of Japanese involvement in an American war in East Asia, and the best way to diminish this risk seems to them to be to get rid of the American bases in Japan and the Japanese-American security treaty.

This, of course, is not the attitude of the Japanese Government and some of those who vote for it. I say only "some," because the governing party's electoral strength is based more on domestic issues than on foreign policy. In the early years of this decade, there were signs that an increasing proportion of the Japanese were beginning to see their security interests in a more realistic way and were thus coming to value the American presence in East Asia. But the growing intensity of the Vietnam war during the past three years has smothered this healthy trend, and once again the chief concern in Japanese minds is the threat to Japan of the American alliance, not the dangers to Japan of an unstable East Asia.

The Japanese case is an extreme one, growing out of a special psychological situation produced by the catastrophe of the Second World War. But many European reactions are not dissimilar. And people in the less developed countries, though the most seriously threatened by instability and war in their parts of the world, are often the least able to see beyond the looming American presence to the real problem. The greatest tragedy about our well-meaning but sometimes frenetic efforts to bring stability to Asia is that they have stood in the way of a realistic understanding of the problems in other countries and thus have inhibited the development of an effective international response, which in the long run can be the only successful answer.

I am not proposing that we should try to transfer the responsibilities for stability in Asia to the Japanese. They would not and could not bear the load. Nor am I suggesting that responsibilities should be apportioned according to national interests, because this would put the heaviest burden on those least able to bear it. Nor am I wistfully hoping that the United Nations will suddenly rise phoenixlike to meet the need.

The United States will obviously have to continue to bear the major share of the load for stability and development in the less developed parts of the world—simply because, as the richest and strongest nation, we can most easily carry this heavy burden. But we should no longer try to do it alone, nor should the task be seen by us and others as a specifically American undertaking in response to a specifically American policy. Such an approach inevitably is self-defeating.

The Indian Ocean area would be a good place in which to start this more modest and more relaxed approach. This is simply because our present commitments there are minimal, and so we can start with a relatively clean slate. We are in a position to wait

and see if the British withdrawal does result in a deterioration of the situation. If it does, we can safely wait until those whose interests are more immediately involved decide to develop, with our full cooperation, of course, an international approach to the problem. If this produces a broadly based international effort, we need have no fears about our own participation, even on a large scale.

It would be premature to guess what shape such an international effort might take, but we can speculate about some of its possible elements. A mobile force might be created to fulfill at least the limited functions the British forces have been performing in the Indian Ocean area, and possibly in time considerably more. A central element of such a force would probably be a fleet comparable in function to our Seventh Fleet in the Western Pacific. Most of this fleet might be American, and, in fact, it might in large part be our Seventh Fleet with additional bases that would permit it to operate, as needed, in the Indian Ocean. For this purpose, it might be best based on the Singapore naval base, of course at the invitation of Singapore and with the approval of Malaysia and probably also Indonesia. It might also have subsidiary bases elsewhere in the Indian Ocean on the invitation of other nations.

It would be important, however, to have not just the bases but also some of the naval units and supporting land and air units provided by other countries besides the United States—those of the area first of all, but also interested outsiders, such as the European countries, Australia and even Japan in time. The Japanese already show some interest in giving support to United Nations peace-keeping activities. In time, they may be ready to take part in other international peace-keeping efforts. If these appear to be clearly in Japan's interests.

More important than the international composition of an Indian Ocean force would be the international character of its objectives. It must be clearly an instrument of international interests, not American. This should be acceptable to the United States, since our objectives in the Indian Ocean area are not narrow national ones but only broad concerns of international stability.

The primary task of the force presumably would be to maintain, as a common international interest, the safety of all on the high seas and on the routes of international commerce. Beyond that, it might seek to give to the area what stability it could at a reasonable cost. In limited crises and in smaller areas, it could play the stabilizing role the British forces have in the past.

The presence of a base structure and some power-in-being would also give the cooperating nations the option to attempt to stop blatant aggression if it occurred. A Korea-type war seems unlikely in the area, but the nations whose interests might be affected if one did occur would at least have the option to intervene if they felt it worthwhile. The very fact that such an option existed would probably go a long way toward deterring a would-be aggressor.

On the other hand, there would be no commitments to the internal stability of any country. Massive intervention in internal disorders, especially in larger countries, would be folly, as our Vietnam experience has clearly shown. The whole history of postwar Asia also suggests that the forces of nationalism are so strong that there is little danger of successful domination of any major national unit from outside. Each country can be safely left to work out its own national destiny. In so far as its stability and development are matters of concern to other nations, the latter can contribute to these ends far better by providing economic and technological assistance and an external environment of stability than by intervening militarily in internal disorders.

The above is a far more specific blueprint than can safely be drawn at this time of doubt about the future. But I have elaborated it to show the general nature of a new approach to our relationship with Asia.

On the one hand, it would be something far more than the SEATO approach, in that it would be truly international in origin, organization and objectives, rather than a thinly disguised American military commitment to individual Asian countries, based on an American concept of stopping the spread of a monolithic Communist movement. On the other hand, it would be much less than the SEATO approach, in that its objectives and commitments would be far more limited, avoiding self-defeating military involvement in maintaining internal stability, and concentrating instead on the real international and American interests, which lie in the maintenance of the freedom of the seas and a general international framework of peace and stability. Equally important, it would reduce the military aspect of our involvement in Asia to a minor supporting role for our far more productive involvement in economic and technological assistance.

While the field is clear for the application of this sort of new approach to the Indian Ocean area, it would take more time and effort to apply it to areas like East and Southeast Asia, where the United States is already deeply involved in a variety of commitments based on the older approach and where specific American interests loom larger than they do in the Indian Ocean. The pattern of the American relationship with these other areas will naturally remain more diverse.

Since Japan is a stable, modernized nation, is our greatest trading partner next to Canada, and contains the bulk of Asia's industrial (and therefore military) power, its defense is a vital interest to us. Moreover, its defense can be safely guaranteed by us, because internal instability and subversion are not problems there. A defense alliance with Japan thus is as sound, one might say inevitable, as with the United Kingdom or Australia. I assume, therefore, that the mutual security treaty with Japan will be maintained and, if possible, strengthened.

Our formal commitments to South Korea, Taiwan and the Philippines will also probably remain. There is a long history behind each of these, and fortunately geography makes it more practicable for us to live up to them than would be the case in most other parts of Asia. Taiwan and the Philippines are islands, and there is no substantial threat to our naval supremacy in the Western Pacific. South Korea, although a peninsula, makes up for its northern land border by a great firmness of will and a relatively high level of political and economic development.

In Southeast Asia we face a more complex situation. Burma and Cambodia offer no problem, since they are opposed to commitments of any sort from us, feeling that a policy of complete neutrality gives them better security. Malaysia, Singapore and Indonesia are in a more ambiguous position and, as I have indicated, might best be considered in the same category as the Indian Ocean area.

Our chief problem centers around Laos and Thailand. Regardless of the outcome in Vietnam, it seems probable that the Vietnamese, a far more numerous, energetic and better organized people than their Laotian neighbors, will in the long run dominate, in one way or another, that small, backward, landlocked country made up of 2.5 million poverty-stricken people divided into diverse ethnic groups. It seems doubtful to me that either the United States or an international body can guarantee to Laos true independence, much less internal stability.

In Thailand, we find a relatively large, prosperous and contented nation, and the only country in Southeast Asia that has managed to maintain its independence

throughout modern times. Despite the small-scale subversive movements in the poor northeast and the even more dangerous overburdening of the country's economy and psychology by a large American military presence, Thailand is not likely to go the way of South Vietnam. Still, a unilateral American commitment to Thailand is not best for us or for the Thais, and this is what we have, in disguised form, through SEATO and, more directly, through our military presence resulting from the use of bases in Thailand to prosecute the war in Vietnam. If Thailand should suffer open aggression (which is unlikely), it would be better for us if the response were international rather than merely American. If Thailand were to be disrupted by Vietnam-style internal subversion, again it would be better for it and for us if we did not become militarily involved.

We cannot, of course, just repudiate the commitments we have made to Thailand. There first must be developed viable regional or international alternatives. In the last few years, several hopeful beginnings in regional organizations have appeared in Southeast Asia, some embracing countries as far afield as Japan and Australia. These regional groupings will probably contribute to economic cooperation and development throughout the area. They may also contribute in a small way to the security of the countries concerned, by developing mutual awareness of one another and thus a broader international concern over the security of each. But these regional organizations are not likely to develop into useful military alliances. The component units, for the most part, are too unstable and militarily too weak.

Broad international commitments would probably be a more realistic substitute than regional ones for unilateral American guarantees to Thailand. In time, the more-than-SEATO approach in international participation and the less-than-SEATO approach in objectives and commitments that I have outlined for the Indian Ocean area could probably be made to apply to Thailand also, and to the rest of Southeast Asia.

Would this, however, be adequate if we envision as a possible outcome in Vietnam the withdrawal of American forces and the eventual unification of the South with the North? Would not the victorious Vietnamese Communists, if not the Chinese, move on then to indirect aggression against Thailand, by stirring up and fueling from outside a successful Communist revolution? This seems to me doubtful. Whatever the outcome in Vietnam, the Vietnamese will probably find that the reconstruction of their own devastated land fully absorbs their energies, and an effort to overthrow other countries will seem to them a less pressing and less rewarding task.

Beyond that, Thailand and South Vietnam are not parallel cases. North and South Vietnam basically form a single country. The Communist revolution had had a long and particularly successful history in the South as well as the North before the division took place. And the fighting in the South was for years carried on only by Southerners, and still is for the most part in their hands. In all these regards, the situation is very different in Thailand. The Vietnamese are hated foreigners to them, and if Thailand were indeed so weak a political unit that it could be overthrown by intrigues fomented and fed by such foreigners, it obviously could not be defended by anyone.

One cannot deny that the still unknown outcome of the war in Vietnam leaves many looming dangers. A new approach to our relationship with Asia, such as I have outlined above, would also run a number of other risks. Would other nations realize in time that they had vital interests in the stability of Asia and make the necessary contributions to an international approach to the problem? Could enough agreement be reached among the

countries concerned to provide an adequate response? Would the threat of indirect aggression through subversion be adequately met by the forces of nationalism? Could the difficult transition from America's go-it-alone approach to a real international effort be made safely? Would we Americans be capable of disengaging ourselves sufficiently to permit the development of an international approach, without swinging back too far into an isolationism which would destroy the whole effort? All these are very real dangers. But taken together they constitute less of a risk than to continue blindly along what has proved to be an impossible course.

[From Life Magazine, Mar. 15, 1968]

VIETNAM: LET'S NOT HAVE MORE OF THE SAME

President Johnson faces an excruciating decision about Vietnam. The immediate question before him last week was whether to grant General Westmoreland's request for another 100,000 or 200,000 troops to meet the new military situation brought about by General Giap's big Tet offensive. But this is just part of a larger decision, for the character of the Vietnam war has changed radically.

We are close to the point where the calling up of the Guard or the Reserves, and the possibility of controls, would put new strains on our manpower and economic resources, and indeed on the American political fabric.

Even after six weeks, the full consequences of the Tet offensive are still under study at the White House, producing alternate bursts of hope and gloom, sobriety and wishful thinking. The trapped and dug-in mood of Washington's policymakers is one of the most depressing aspects of the situation. "Everyone is out of bright ideas," says one of them. In Saigon the government, whose overthrow was one of Giap's chief objectives, has at least survived. Its army acquitted itself well during the worst of the Tet fighting and is mostly intact. But the problems now facing the Thieu-Ky government are staggering—over 600,000 new refugees, miles of city rubble, a stunned economy, shattered communications and pervasive fear in the cities as well as in the countryside.

At this climactic point in the Vietnamese war, there are perhaps five courses open to U.S. policy. They are these:

Severe Escalation. The extreme hawks would not just send more troops but add new bomb targets (Haiphong harbor) and new battlefields (such as invading Laos or North Vietnam). A few even talk recklessly of using tactical nuclear weapons. The risks of a new world war in such major escalations range from unacceptable to outrageous.

More of the Same. The U.S. could support Westmoreland's present strategy—a war of attrition—with as much manpower as he needs for as long as it takes to defeat the Communist forces in the field. This might mean years.

One More Try. Or the U.S. could pursue "more of the same" but not indefinitely. We might launch major offensive operations of our own with the hope (but obviously no announcement) that one big effort could end the war soon. Looking back over the past few years, the President sometimes thinks he should have applied more massive force sooner. As General Gavin says, a limited war should be limited in time as well as in space.

Change of Strategy. The U.S. could re-examine the strategy of attrition, the war of body counts. Instead of seeking out Giap's main-force units, we could put more emphasis on clearing and holding the populated areas, on pacification and on uprooting the V.C. infrastructure (LIFE Editorials, Jan. 5 and 12). Many dedicated missions, military as well as civilian, have worked hard at these very things, but this side of the war has never been given overriding priority.

Withdrawal. The U.S. could start pulling out with whatever dignity we can muster

on whatever terms we can get, taking what comfort we could in Walter Lippmann's argument that this need not be a U.S. military "defeat" but rather an acknowledgment of a costly policy mistake. Cold comfort for Saigon.

Of these five alternatives the first and fifth are unnecessarily desperate.

The other three provide a reasonable frame for argument. At the Tuesday luncheons, where the President sets war policy with Rusk, Rostow and now with new Defense Secretary Clark Clifford, most of the talk is believed to favor the "More of the Same" alternative, i.e., more troops in support of the same old war of attrition. We consider this a bad choice.

There are too many gaps in any journalist's information—including the imminent possibility of new offensives—to say flatly that Westmoreland should not have more men. If the sole purpose of sending more men is to enable Westmoreland to continue what he has been doing, we are opposed. In some ways, more "white faces" in a land that already sees too many of them will make our problem worse. Even if Westmoreland recovers his mobility, it is a Red Queen kind of progress—back to where we were before Jan. 30. And Giap can send in more troops, too. The attrition strategy reminds some Westmoreland critics of "the Haig syndrome"—named after the bulldozing British marshal of World War I—"Give me another 100,000 men, Sir, and I can assure you we will have finished the job by Christmas." Except that Westmoreland makes no such promises these days.

It is time to reassess our strategy in Vietnam. It has been based, we believe, on an error expressed by General Wheeler in 1962, an error which still governs too much official thinking: "The essence of the problem in Vietnam is military." On the contrary, the essence of the problem is political. As General Wheeler and others would agree, the true goal and purpose of our presence in Vietnam is to leave behind a viable self-governing country, and its military dimension is the physical security of the South Vietnamese people. The momentum of military responses has diverted us too far from this goal.

Redirecting ourselves to the goal means de-escalating our war with the North Vietnamese. It means avoiding pitched battles with their main-force units in underpopulated wilderness like Khesanh and concentrating on the closer defense of South Vietnamese population centers, even though this may involve abandoning considerable real estate. It means shifting the emphasis of American participation from combat to the more intensive training and equipping of South Vietnamese forces; and if more men are needed, the South Vietnamese (who are at last drafting their 19-year-olds) should supply them. Instead of widening the war's perimeter, we should even reduce it for the sake of better security where most of the people live.

The strategic bombing of North Vietnam, beyond the rear of the battleground, should be halted. Its military effectiveness has long been questionable anyway. A bombing halt would be the most audible invitation to reciprocal de-escalation on Hanoi's part. It is also the quickest way to learn what Hanoi means by "negotiations," which U Thant now assures us we could begin in days. A lot of Americans, as well as the rest of the world, would feel better if, before making any new troop commitments, we had made a more convincing effort to negotiate. One way to test Communist intentions would be to determine how ready they are in negotiations to move to a complete cease-fire on the battlefield.

Another reason for favoring some de-escalation is the political effect on the Thieu-Ky regime, which has yet to shape up as the focus of South Vietnamese hopes and loyal-

ties. Giap's attack on the cities did not generate mass conversions to the V.C. side, but neither did the war-weary population rally further to the government. The government needs to widen its political base instead of nervously jailing its opposition. The future of South Vietnam is, at this juncture, greatly dependent on the behavior of its own leaders. We cannot pass a miracle and turn South Vietnam overnight into a brave democracy, but we can avoid the blunder of protracting its dependence on U.S. arms or becoming ourselves the captives of its policies.

In recent weeks we have been given a hard lesson in how not to fight this war; we have not lost all chance of bringing it to an acceptable conclusion.

COAL UNION'S ANTINUCLEAR CAMPAIGN BACKFIRES—AND BACKFIRES AGAIN

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, it may be recalled that no long ago I had occasion to invite the attention of my colleagues to a campaign by certain coal interests to denigrate the civilian nuclear power industry. At that time I referred to the terror tactics being employed by President W. A. "Tony" Boyle, of the United Mine Workers, in his antinuclear campaign, and predicted that the coal industry and the miners—not the nuclear industry—would be the losers. Judging from recent press accounts, it appears that my prediction is being borne out even sooner than anticipated.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I will include an article from the March 7, 1968, edition of the Washington Daily News, by Staff Writer Stanley Levey, in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The article, headlined "UMW Split on Use of Atomic Energy," reports that Mr. Boyle recently felt obliged to expel District 50 from the United Mine Workers because its members had the temerity to adopt a resolution recognizing that there is room for development of all forms of energy—coal, oil, gas, and—heaven forbid—nuclear.

Mr. Boyle likens the action of District 50 to that of a "thankless child"—a child which, incidentally, has grown to be twice the size of the enraged parent. In a perhaps more apt analogy, staff writer Levey likens Mr. Boyle's campaign to King Canute's unsuccessful efforts to hold back the sea.

Some of these same coal interests may be interested to learn that their campaign to uninvent the peaceful uses of the atom is backfiring on other fronts.

Recently they approached the publisher of a leading Baltimore, Md., newspaper to draw his attention to the alleged dangers of nuclear power and to urge that his newspaper—the Baltimore News American—publish "the facts" in this regard. In contacting a publisher in Baltimore, I am sure these coal union spokesmen were not unmindful of the proposal of the Baltimore Gas & Electric Co. to build two large nuclear powerplants down the coast from Baltimore on the Chesapeake Bay.

The publisher assigned his science writer, Mohammed Rauf, Jr., to the

story. In the best tradition of impartial journalism, Mr. Rauf investigated both sides of the issue before writing his piece and, as requested by the coal interest, did indeed publish "the facts."

Mr. Rauf's article is an objective and balanced treatment of the issues involved. His characterization of the UMW efforts is comparable to Mr. Levey's. Mr. Rauf compares the bitter struggle of the UMW to the fruitless fight of the stage-coach against the "iron horse," and finds that both had one thing in common: "the opposition of vested interests to scientific progress and a better way of doing things." I commend Mr. Rauf's article to the reading of my colleagues and anyone else who may be interested, and include it in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

To avoid any confusion that might otherwise arise in the minds of some I should clarify for the record the fact that the trade union official referred to in Mr. Rauf's article as "atomic energy's most implacable foe" is indeed none other than the gentleman who on a number of occasions in the past reproached the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy because it was not pushing the development of nuclear reactors as vigorously as he would have liked.

I especially recall this gentleman's appearance before the Joint Committee in 1960, when he urged that modern production-line techniques be used to turn out 1,000 reactors for early distribution in this country and abroad. At that time he regretted to see "the coal industry filibustering progress in atomic energy." He said:

I am hopeful, that those in the coal industry who fear progress in atomic energy will come to realize that they are mistaken.

For whatever it is worth I suppose I should also point out that the individual involved has since that time changed his affiliation from one trade union to another.

The articles referred to follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Mar. 7, 1968]

UMW SPLIT ON USE OF ATOMIC ENERGY—PARENT UNION BITTER AT DISTRICT 50 IN POLICY FIGHT

(By Stanley Levey)

Like King Canute who tried unsuccessfully to hold back the sea, the United Mine Workers of America is attempting to halt the peaceful use of atomic energy.

And this undertaking has brought the union into bitter conflict with its own creation and affiliate—District 50, which thinks atomic energy is here to stay.

The UMW sees further loss of job opportunities for its 125,000 coal miners if the atom replaces coal to fuel power plants and big industrial installations.

Ironically, while the parent UMW has shrunk in size over the years, the catch-all District 50, with thousands of workers in the chemical and atomic energy industries, now has 225,000 members.

IRONIC

A further irony is that the UMW was one of the first labor groups in the country to accept the realities of automation.

The dispute between the UMW and District 50 was triggered by the latter's recent adoption of a resolution linking its future with the progress and development of the atomic energy industry. Yesterday, the dispute be-

came critical (the word used by atomic physicists to describe the point preceding a nuclear explosion).

POUND TABLE

Pounding the table in the UMW board room, W. A. (Tony) Boyle, president, ordered District 50 expelled after 30 days. And he served notice on the "thankless child," as he termed the affiliate, that it must also drop the name "District 50, United Mine Workers of America."

A few minutes later, half a block away in another UMW building which District 50 rents from the parent union for \$4050 a month, Elwood Moffett, the president and a coal miner and son of a coal miner, quietly observed that while there wasn't much he intended to do about expulsion, he would fight the order to drop the name.

"We don't intend to quarrel with the UMW," he said softly, "after all the UMW under John L. created district 50. . . . We'll go along doing what we've been doing."

What the District has been doing is signing up any kind of worker it could. At various times, the union has had as members taxi drivers, basketball referees, construction workers, public utility workers and the clerical staff of the UMW welfare fund.

QUIT QUARTERS

Mr. Boyle intimidated District 50 would be asked to give up its present quarters. The affiliate has no lease, renting on a month-to-month basis. The prospect of losing about \$225,000 a year in dues from the affiliate did not appear to worry the UMW, one of the richest unions in the world with assets of \$95 million (not including four buildings here and ownership of the National Bank of Washington).

COAL INDUSTRY ASSAILS N-PLANTS AS UNSAFE, COSTLY—FEDERAL SUBSIDIES DEcriED

(By Mohammed Rauf, Jr.)

The stage coach vs. the "iron horse." Coal vs. nuclear power for generating electricity!

The first struggle was fought in the last century. The second is being fought today. Both have one thing in common: the opposition of vested interests to scientific progress and a better way of doing things.

With the increasing use in the country of nuclear energy for generating electricity, the coal industry feels that a day may come when it will be wiped out of business.

To prevent such an eventuality, it is fighting hammer and thongs the spread of nuclear power plants.

Its main contentions:

Nuclear power plants are a serious hazard to human life, because a major accident in a plant can spread damage over a wide area, according to Leo Goodman, a trade union official in Washington, who is nationally recognized as atomic energy's most implacable foe.

Nuclear plants are expensive to build, and are receiving an inordinate amount of federal subsidy. "We can't compete against federal treasury," said Justin McCarthy, editor of The Journal, the official publication of the United Mine Workers Union.

Nuclear plants aren't quite feasible, because the country does not have enough uranium to fuel them, according to Brice O'Brien, counsel for the National Coal Association.

Nuclear plants aren't needed, because American coal mines have enough coal to last a thousand years—a finding confirmed by the Bureau of Mines.

The discharge of treated water from reactors into rivers and seas can wipe out marine life, Goodman said.

Nuclear fatalities and accidents have been too numerous to be ignored, Goodman added.

"The claims made by the Atomic Energy Commission about the safety aspects of nuclear plants are devious and dubious," Good-

man said, "because AEC and the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy are in conspiracy to hide the true situation from the public."

This opposition of the coal industry is expressed through an unending succession of public statements, speeches, arguments on Capitol Hill, the publication of hundreds of pamphlets and brochures deriding atomic energy.

The name-calling has become so acrimonious that Cong. Craig Hosmer, member of the Joint Congressional Committee, recently appealed to W. A. Boyle, president of the United Mine Workers, to agree to a "cease-fire, because the campaign is helping no one and hurting only the coal industry."

Cong. Hosmer warned: "But if Mr. Boyle wants to continue this fight, I can escalate it right up to the top of coal's ugly, smoke-belching, air-polluting and radiation-spewing smokestacks."

Experts are of the opinion that the growth of nuclear plants will not put coal out of business, because the country's future needs for energy are so fantastic that both coal and nuclear power will be needed to fully meet them.

However, competition from nuclear energy has had two effects on the coal industry:

The coal industry's expansion can hardly be on the scale it would like it to be.

The competition is forcing the industry to keep down the price of coal. One estimate is that this competition has saved the consumer \$1 billion a year for the past 10 years in coal prices.

Coal's opposition to nuclear energy has failed to slow down the construction of reactors. Only in one case has it been able to prevent the building of a reactor. Public reaction in Ravenswood, N.Y., was so strong against reactors that the local power company felt compelled to withdraw its application to build one.

Elsewhere the building of reactors is proceeding at a fast pace. It has become the "in" thing with power companies, because the major builders of electrical generating systems are backlogged with orders for nuclear-fueled systems, which are now in greater demand than conventional fossil-fueled systems.

There are 14 nuclear power plants in operation in the country today, 10 under construction, 31 in the planning stage for which sites have been selected, and 10 in the pre-site planning stage. Their capacity is equal to more than 10 percent of the generating capacity of existing conventional plants.

Proponents of nuclear energy answer coal's charges this way:

A nuclear power reactor is not a bomb, and will not explode like a bomb.

"In a bomb, the nuclear material is almost pure, highly fissionable. In a civilian power reactor the nuclear fuel is always in the form of a chemical compound or alloy totally unsuitable for use in a bomb," said Dr. Joseph Lieberman, assistant director of nuclear safety.

"The charge of federal subsidy is untenable, because not since 1963 has any of the light water reactors ordered by the utilities been federally subsidized," said Sen. John Pastore, another member of Congressional Committee.

The Power Plant scheduled for Denver in the coming years will indeed be federally subsidized to the extent of several million dollars, "but that will be because of its experimental nature," an AEC spokesman said.

"In all our history, the government has been subsidizing up and coming industries," Lieberman said. "It gave the railroads money to extend beyond the Mississippi, it subsidized research on the Supersonic Airplane, and now the federal government alone is carrying out research on the hypersonic airplane, the results of which will be turned over to private industry."

"And, lastly, it must not be overlooked

that plenty of research in coal mining and coal usage is done with federal money."

The shortage of uranium is recognized, but the recent invention of the breeder reactor (a reactor which produces its own fuel) has minimized this need for the foreseeable future.

It is acknowledged that the nation's coal reserves are enough to meet requirements for the next 1,500 years "at the present rate" of consumption, but the smog and pollution problem that will arise with increased use of coal to meet "all" the needs is considered staggering.

"There is no alternative to smog and air pollution but the installation of nuclear plants that don't pollute the atmosphere," Cong. Hosmer stated.

Reactors discharge heated water into the rivers and seas, but the harmful effect this can have on marine life is not fully proved.

"I won't call this discharge thermal pollution, but thermal enrichment, because in many cases the warm water has led to an increase in marine life," Cong. Hosmer said.

Goodman's figures on nuclear fatalities are challenged. It was found that of the 400 fatalities listed by him, only seven were caused by radiation. The others were industrial fatalities, or deaths at foreign nuclear plants.

"Safety requirements for reactors are the most strict of any agency," according to Congressional Committee officials.

They point to the fact that the AEC and its contractors have won the National Safety Council's Award of Honor during four years; the AEC has won the President's Award for Safety Among Federal Employees for the same number of years, and that the AEC's accident rate is one-third of the nation's industrial average over the past 23 years.

"The success of AEC's safety program is nothing short of extraordinary," said Howard Pyle, president of the National Safety Council. "The records show that the AEC and its centers compare with the safest in all industries."

Chancey Starr, president of Atomic International, put it in a different way: "The safety requirements are so strict, and the chance of an explosion are so remote that they can be likened to a jet plane falling upon the Rose Bowl when a major game is in progress. Certainly, if that happens we would neither give up football nor flying..."

Coal's weakest point, of course, is the air pollution that it causes. And it is generally recognized that the only answer to the problem is the introduction of smoke-free reactors for producing electricity and driving the wheels of industry.

Coal's other weak point is that it produces refuse banks that are not only an eyesore, but portions of which are always on fire. These banks, in some instances, are as much as 800 feet high and a mile long. Not only do they take up a lot of space, but they also cave in, providing additional hazard to life and property.

Concluded Sen. Pastore: "Between now and the year 2000, this nation is going to have to build the equivalent of seven additional power systems of the size that is now serving the American people."

"To meet this tremendous surge we will have need for increasing amounts of all forms of fuels—coal, oil, gas, hydro and nuclear. The suppliers of fossil fuels will be hard-pressed to meet the ever-increasing demands that will be placed upon them."

The conclusion: development of all forms of fuels, according to the Congressional Committee.

THE COMMUNIST CALL FOR AN INTERNATIONAL STUDENT STRIKE: 1968

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my re-

CXIV—441—Part 6

marks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, on March 31, 1967, the House Committee on Un-American Activities released its well-documented and timely report on the "Communist Origin and Manipulation of Vietnam Week, April 8-15, 1967."

This report gave valuable insight into the reasons why a planned nationwide student strike for the spring of 1967 never happened. Extensive planning and organization for the 1967 student strike fell by the wayside when dissident leftist elements withdrew their support in the critical months of organizing. In place of the strike, the Spring Mobilization Committee—now National Mobilization Committee—and the Student Mobilization Committee—SMC—engineered and staged simultaneous demonstrations in New York City and San Francisco on April 15, 1967. A week of campus anti-Vietnam war demonstrations prior to last April 15 was but an ugly prelude to the mass demonstrations on either coast.

At the culmination of Vietnam Week last year, the American citizen was left stunned. Indelibly stamped on his mind were the front page photos of his country's beloved flag being burned in New York City. Other photographs of the demonstration showed an unruly mob waving flags of the Vietcong and raising large portraits of Ho Chi Minh.

Broadcasts of the demonstrations picked out the shrill voices raised in vilification of the American Government and even in denouncement of America's sons in service to their country. On April 15, 1967, demonstrations were clearly staged in defiance of the determination of our people to help resist Communist aggression in Southeast Asia. Those hysterical voices which screamed out over loudspeakers in eulogy of the Communist aggressor will not soon be forgotten by any decent American.

What began as a "massive protest demonstration against U.S. Government policy" in Vietnam, was skillfully maneuvered into a carnival of unmistakable support for a Communist victory in Vietnam.

THE ABORTIVE 1967 "STRIKE" PROPOSAL

In the chain of events which led to the ultimate demonstrations last year in New York and San Francisco, the Communist Party—CPUSA—and the Communist-organized and controlled W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America—DCA—were the driving forces behind the plan to hold a nationwide student strike in sympathy with the Vietcong and the Communist North Vietnamese.¹

Bettina Aptheker Kurzweil, daughter of chief CPUSA theoretician, Herbert Aptheker, and herself a dedicated party functionary and CPUSA national committee member, promoted the student strike idea—almost singlehandedly—for

¹ Communist Origin and Manipulation of Vietnam Week (April 8-15, 1967), Committee on Un-American Activities, March 31, 1967, page 53.

more than a year. Factionalism among the several Communist, splinter, new left and "peace" groups—coupled with a series of individual power plays for the claim of leadership of the proposed student strike movement—proved nearly too much for the newly formed United Front to overcome.

However, a coalition of veteran Communist organizers, "peace" agitators, and special interest promoters, took control of the base of the strike movement and manipulated it into what was to become the notorious Vietnam Week demonstrations which took place throughout the country.²

The Trotskyist Communist Socialist Workers Party—SWP—eventually solidified their hold on the key administrative posts of the spring and students mobilization groups, and according to the leader of a rival Communist organization, the SWP shared this leadership with what they called the revisionist Communist Party, the CPUSA.³

As I reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 8, 1967, the Communists had hoped to salvage the plans for a nationwide student strike last year in conjunction with their Vietnam Week activities. Despite extensive efforts toward this end, as many will remember, not one college, university, or high school responded to the Communist call for nationwide student strike.

The student strike idea, as I mentioned, had been vetoed by influential elements within the new left; not because of the comfort the strike would have given the North Vietnamese enemy; not because it had been rightfully found to be morally wrong; but because it was considered that it "was not realistic" at that time.⁴

In the review of why the nationwide student strike was dropped in favor of broad based Vietnam Week demonstrations, we must consider the position and influence of the largest of the new left groups, the Students for a Democratic Society—SDS.

In July of 1966, Bettina Aptheker arranged for her arguments for the student strike to be published and distributed to the SDS National Administration Committee. The SDS-NAC went on record as opposed to the idea, and several position papers on the strike issue were widely distributed to the SDS chapters. SDS consensus was that they had always wound up furnishing "the bodies" but not the leadership for somebody else's demonstration. SDS leaders at the December 1967 Chicago strike conference

² The early organization of the student strike group was under the diversified leadership of the younger members of the SDS, Chicago Peace Council, Committees to End the War in Vietnam, U.S. National Student Association, and other student and "peace" groups which can generally be considered as part of the new left. After the 1967 Chicago Strike Conference, hard core Communist elements emerged from the November 8 Mobilization Committee (Cleveland) and formed the Spring Mobilization Committee. Ibid, pages 33-37.

³ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 113, pt. 9, p. 11963.

⁴ See pages 37-42, Communist Origin and Manipulation of Vietnam Week, op. cit.

said they felt they were being "used" by the strike organizers. It was also evident that SDS coveted the leadership of the strike movement and when it became apparent that hard core Communist organizers would not even share the leadership with SDS, the leaders of the new left group quietly bowed out. Without the prospect of "bodies" from SDS, the Communists merely shelved the idea for 1 year.

W. E. B. DU BOIS CLUBS (DCA)

Almost to the day, 1 year later, the strike proposal was taken off the shelf by the Communist Party, U.S.A., dusted, and offered again as new merchandise.

On January 6, 1968, the New York area Du Bois Clubs held a meeting to approve the international student strike. The meeting was chaired by CPUSA national committeeman, Robert Heisler, who presented a position paper on the strike from the DCA national committee.

The elements of the DCA position were essentially a rerun of Bettina Aptheker's dream: resurrecting the old Communist-led 1936 student strike which took place during the Oxford pledge days.

Some of us here today are old enough to remember the date, April 22, 1936, when a half million college students had an antiwar strike led by a Communist united front under the auspices of the American Student Union. Thousands of misguided American students about this same time had signed what was termed the "Oxford pledge" which stated in part:

We will support no war undertaken by the U.S. Government.

Oddly enough, most of those students who signed the "pledge" fought and even died for their country when the time came.

The DCA national committee forecast the possibility of getting 10 percent—or approximately 600,000—of this Nation's college students to participate in the 1-day strike as a protest against: the Vietnam war, racism, "imperialism," defense research programs in universities, campus complicity with Armed Forces recruiters, CIA recruiters, and Dow Chemical Co., representatives seeking potential employees from graduating students.

The New York area Du Bois Clubs unanimously resolved to wholeheartedly support Bettina Aptheker's "strike" proposal for the second year in a row.

These same clubs gave approval of: First, working for a broad grouping of delegates to the Chicago strike conference—to include students from all walks of campus society. Second, making the strike a combined student-faculty affair. Third, extending participation in the strike to include even high school

students and teachers. Fourth, setting up a propaganda-literature table at the Chicago strike conference and having it well stocked with partyline propaganda of the Communist Party. Fifth, demanding that the issue of the Vietnam war be fused with the "racial issue" in promoting the international student strike.

MOBILIZATION: IN THE MEANTIME

In its 1 year of existence, the Student Mobilization Committee has asserted itself in the leadership role of "mobilization against the war in Vietnam." The SMC has sent reams of propaganda to its members and potential supporters promoting the October 20 antidraft disturbances in Oakland, Calif., and the October 21 confrontation at the Pentagon. Additionally, the mobilization group proclaimed that it was "coordinating a week of national protest against the draft and the war, December 4-8, 1967."

On May 13 and 14, 1967, the SMC held a strike conference in Chicago which was attended by a claimed 500 to 600. This early conference went almost unnoticed by the public; and in terms of purpose was a complete failure as no decision on the strike was reached.

A December 1967 issue of the Student Mobilizer, official publication of the Student Mobilization Committee, told of initial plans for a possible international student strike for the spring of 1968, and described a planned January 1968 strike conference in Chicago to talk it over.

In early January, the SMC sent a flyer to its mailing list. The flyer was titled "Call to a National Student Antiwar Conference," and in smaller type beneath, "To Discuss an International Student Strike in the Spring."

The conference was set for January 27, 28, and 29, 1968, at the University of Chicago.

In addition to a request for contributions and/or more information on the conference, the SMC described itself in the following words:

The Student Mobilization Committee is the broad coalition of student and youth groups on over 600 campuses which organized Vietnam Week April 8-15, student participation in the October 21st [Pentagon] Confrontation in Washington, and called for Stop the Draft Week, Dec. 4th to 8th.⁵

On January 19, 1968, the SMC sent a letter to all conference participants along with a proposed agenda.

The letter stated that students from 30 States had "written us that they will be present."

The letter added:

Among questions to be discussed are a proposed international student strike, and possible action at the Democratic national convention in August [1968].

James Forman, international secretary and a ranking member on the central committee of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee—SNCC—and Arthur Kinoy, the attorney who was forcibly ejected from a congressional com-

mittee hearing, were billed as the key speakers for the Chicago conference.⁷ Kinoy was subsequently convicted on a charge of disorderly conduct for his disturbance during hearings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities in August 1966.

THE CHICAGO STRIKE CONFERENCE

The east and west coast Communist Party newspapers, the Worker and People's World, respectively, gave generous coverage to the mobilization conference group.

In its January 2, 1968, issue, People's World stated:

An estimated 1,000 students from over 30 states are scheduled to meet on the University of Chicago campus this weekend.

Members of the Student Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam, sponsors of the gathering, say it will be the largest student anti-war conference since the start of U.S. aggression in Southeast Asia.

The 1968 strike conference was to be plagued with diverse organizational and special interest infighting for leadership positions and priority of issues.

SNCC and SDS, while organizationally committed to the student strike issue, were typically undecided as to their tactical approach to the strike at the outset of the Chicago strike conference.

The DuBois Clubs "raised \$1,000 to send a busload of black and Puerto Rican youth to the conference."⁸

People's World also reported that:

Larry Konner of the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs said his organization supported the strike.⁹

Of course, the strike was the brainchild of DCA's own Bettina Aptheker in the first place. As an example of understatement, the DCA has had printed and widely distributed a 10-page pamphlet entitled "For a Student Strike—An Immodest Proposal." The DuBois Clubs document covers the arguments for and against an international student strike from A to Z in an attempt to head off any organizational differences which served to kill the strike in April 1967. The DuBois Clubs proposal especially courted the participation of the SDS, and stated:

We believe that the SDS proposal for "Ten Days That Shook The Empire," to be held in April, should be seen as consistent with a Strike and not in opposition to it.

In its preconference coverage, the Worker stated that the strike "backers this time feel that events have made such a strike not only feasible, but desirable" and added:

The international aspect of the strike adds greatly to its value.

And:

Action initiated by U.S. students will be the focus for actions by students all over the world.

On the international aspects of the strike, the Worker continued:

Students in Western Europe, Japan, the socialist countries, and the so-called third world countries are expected to strike their schools the same day.

⁷ Letter and conference agenda dated January 19, 1968 on the letterhead of the Student Mobilization Committee. Letter opens "Dear Friends" and is signed "the staff."

⁸ People's World, January 27, 1968, page 12.

⁹ Ibid.

⁵ The world Communist movement has branded present U.S. foreign policy—particularly in South Korea and South Vietnam—as "imperialistic." In Communist propaganda "imperialism" is a term of opprobrium as applied almost exclusively to the United States. Throughout the free world it is generally accepted that the past and present policy of the U.S.S.R. most historically resembles the definition of "imperialism" in its total domination of the majority of nations under communist rule.

⁶ Undated flyer of the Student Mobilization Committee received in early January, 1968.

In the February 4, 1968 issue of the Worker, the official name of the strike was printed in bold type "Students' Anti-War, Anti-Racist Strike April 26, 1968."

The Communist Party paper went on to give extensive coverage of the strike conference and stated proudly that the attendance was "almost 1,000 students from U.S. colleges and high schools."

The independent Communist weekly newspaper Guardian—formerly National Guardian—of February 10, 1968, noted that there were precisely 679 registrants at the Chicago strike conference, and:

The most disappointing aspect of the conference was its failure to draw significant numbers of new, unaffiliated students.

Prior to the first plenary session of the strike conference a black caucus was formed and officers were chosen. John Wilson, SNCC's antidraft coordinator, was elected chairman of the new "National Black Anti-War, Anti-Draft Union—NBAWADU."

NBAWADU then issued its own call for an international student strike stating:

The 26th day of April [1968] has been set aside . . . as a day for all students throughout the Third World to join the black students of the United States in an International Student Strike.¹⁰

Bettina Aptheker, the CPUSA's top youth agitator, took the podium after the strike proposal was endorsed and proposed an international strike against the Vietnam war, racial oppression, and the draft.

Robert Heisler, aforementioned CPUSA official and education director for the DuBois Clubs, called for the mobilization to aid in defense of the five Texas Southern University students who are being tried for murder of a policeman in connection with the May 16-17, 1967, student riots there.

SDS, whose numbers comprised about one-fifth of the total attendance, felt that their membership could take part in the 1-day student strike as a part of their 10 days to shake the empire campaign, April 21-30, 1968.¹¹

Lawyer Arthur Kinoy addressed the mobilization gathering and verbally painted the false picture of a gigantic wave of repression on the part of the Federal Government aimed at stifling antiwar groups and individuals.

Gwendolyn Patton, formerly southern regional director of the U.S. National Student Association—USNSA—and new NBAWADU national secretary, joined with Linda Morse—nee Dannenberg—to hold a press conference to announce the strike and say that NBAWADU was "laying the groundwork for a power base in the black community to fight against the war, the draft, and U.S. imperialism."¹²

COMMUNIST MOBILIZATION PERSONNEL

The mobilization this year exhibits principally the same individual Communist leadership that masterminded and engineered the Vietnam Week demonstrations of April 8-15, 1967.

Included among the names of those Communists who work openly in the front ranks of the mobilization are: Bettina Aptheker, Phyllis Kalb, Kipp Dawson, and Alex Chernowitz.

Already Bettina Aptheker, a CPUSA official has asserted herself in the role of titular head of the Mobilization.

Phyllis Kalb, publicly identified Communist youth leader, is a national coordinator of the SMC.

Kipp Dawson, who was a prominent leader of the Spring Mobilization Committee last year, is listed as a national coordinator for the student group this year. Miss Dawson is a publicly identified member of the Young Socialist Alliance, youth arm of the Socialist Workers Party.

Alex Chernowitz, one of the mobilization's national coordinators, has been previously identified as chairman of the City College of New York chapter of Youth Against War and Fascism—YAWF—and a member of the editorial staff of Partisan, a YAWF publication. YAWF is the youth affiliate of the Trotskyist-Splinter Workers World Party.

ORGANIZATIONAL PARTICIPATION

Organizations reported to have had representatives present at the Chicago student strike conference, include:¹³

Students for a Democratic Society, which J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, described as working "constantly in furtherance of the aims and objectives of the Communist Party throughout the Nation";

University Christian Movement;

Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, whose immediate past chairman has called for the overthrow of the present Government and the start of "the real revolution" in the United States;

Young Socialist Alliance: Youth affiliate of the Socialist Workers Party;

W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America: Communist-organized, Marxist-oriented youth group whose aims and objectives parallel those of the CPUSA;

Youth Against War and Fascism: Youth affiliate of the Trotskyist-splinter Workers World Party;

Southern Student Organizing Committee: The "white counterpart" to SNCC;

Veterans for Peace in Vietnam: A group which has been publicly characterized as a "straight Communist Party operation" and among whose leadership are identified Communist Party members;

Socialist Workers Party: An avowedly Trotskyist Communist group working for the overthrow of the present U.S. Government;

current ideological approach which is being fostered by the recently-formed Tri-Continental Information Center, headquartered in New York City. This center, whose sponsors include identified Communists, sees itself as being founded "to help counteract the role of the U.S. espionage network." The tri-continental comprises the land masses of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

¹³ The Militant, February 5, 1968, page 1.

Resistance: A radical antidraft organization whose leadership has been known to support Communist objectives;

Communist Party, U.S.A.: A Soviet-directed and Soviet-supported organized Communist movement in the United States;

Committee for Nonviolent Action—(CNVA): A radical "pacifist" organization;

War Resisters League: A pacifist group;

Harlem Black Anti-Draft Union: A New York City-based organization of Negro antidraft agitators; and

Progressive Labor Party: A radical Peking-oriented, Communist-splinter organization which "aggressively and militantly strives to develop followers for its goal, a socialist United States based on Marxist-Leninist principles."

NATIONAL MOBILIZATION COMMITTEE

While a certain amount of organizational overlap was in evidence prior to the Vietnam Week demonstrations in April 1967, it is generally accepted throughout the U.S. intelligence community that the Student Mobilization Committee was primarily responsible for coordinating the demonstrations and disruptive activities which took place on the college campuses and at the Federal buildings in several cities throughout the Nation.

The National Mobilization Committee, an organization of older and more experienced "agitators" and special-interest promoters who are very closely allied with the SMC, are credited with the planning and engineering of the April 15, 1967, antiwar, pro-North Vietnam demonstrations in New York City and San Francisco.

The National Mobilization Committee—formerly Spring Mobilization Committee—is headquartered at 5 Beekman Street in New York City and has, in the past, maintained west coast office at 55 Colton Street in San Francisco.

A letterhead bulletin for the National Mobilization Committee—received February 25, 1968, lists its officers, as follows:

Chairman, Dave Dellinger (Dellinger was quoted in a Washington newspaper as admitting to being a Communist—but not of the Soviet variety.)

National Director, Rev. James Bevel (Bevel is a former aide to Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr. "on loan" to the mobilization.)

National Coordination, Prof. Robert Greenblatt (a leader of the Inter-University Committee for Debate on Foreign Policy (IUC).)

Co-chairmen: Rev. Ralph Abernathy, Al Evanoff, Prof. Donald Kalish, Sidney Lens, Lincoln Lynch, Prof. Sidney Peck, Rt. Rev. Charles O. Rice, Cleveland Robinson, Dagmar Wilson.

Quoting from the National Mobilization Committee bulletin:

The price for America's arrogance and inhumanity is being paid by the dead and wounded in Vietnam, the poor and oppressed [sic] in our ghettos at home, the children in our congested schools, and the countless others in our society who are being neglected or sacrificed so long as war continues. The total effect of these policies is that we have become a warmaking society.

Opposition and open resistance to the American aggression in Vietnam is growing. It is imperative that this opposition be kept

¹⁰ The Militant, February 5, 1968, page 2.

¹¹ This is a paraphrase of the title of John Reed's book on the Communist revolution in Russia, "Ten Days That Shook the World."

¹² This statement is indicative of the current communist ideology which views the "oppressed" peoples of the free world as "revolutionaries" belonging to a "Third World" force which will rise up and replace existing non-Communist governments in the years ahead.

"Anti-imperialism" is the theme of this

visible in all its depth and diversity. (Emphasis in original)

In the next page and one-half of its bulletin, the National Mobilization Committee calls upon all American citizens to support the SDS "10 days" of protest and resistance—April 21–30, 1968. The National Mobilization Committee also calls for support of the "international student strike on April 26, 1968," and the day of "international mass actions" on April 27, 1968.

The National Mobilization Committee asks each locality to work out its own format for the 10-day period and notify them of their plans.

The committee bulletin even suggests targets for visible opposition by stating:

The Symbols and machinery of war, violence and oppression are all around us: draft boards, napalm plants, air plane and armament factories, military installations, repressive police departments, etc. [sic.]

HIGH SCHOOL STUDENT MOBILIZATION COMMITTEE

The Student Mobilization Committee has even extended its efforts to recruit more bodies for its student strike down to the impressionable high school student level.

A handbill distributed to various high schools in the New York City area exhorts younger students to:

Strike! Oppose the war that kills your fathers and brothers!! Oppose the school administration that teaches that the killing of over a million Vietnamese in a racist war is legal!! Oppose the drafting of our friends and brothers, to die in a war we didn't start!!! High School Students! Leave your schools for one day to protest the war, the draft, and racial oppression!

The address and telephone number of the High School Student Mobilization Committee on the handbill is identical to the Student Mobilization Committee in New York City.

STUDENT STRIKE—DIVERGENT VIEWS

As one might expect, the various Communist elements within the mobilization were not without their differences as to the theme of the strike—or whether there should be any strike at all.

In the continuation of infighting, the Progressive Labor Party—PLP—"launched a direct attack both on the Student Mobilization Committee and the proposed student strike." PLP exhorted strike conference delegates at the plenary session to "vote against the student strike and to dissolve the SMC."¹⁴ It should be explained that the Progressive Labor Party are proponents of violent revolution as opposed to disruptive resistance. The student strike is classified as disruptive resistance.

However, the two largest domestic Communist organizations and their respective youth adjuncts—CPUSA—DCA and SWP—YSA—both proponents of the strike proposal—were reported in the Communist press to have resolved their tactical differences regarding the student strike and preserve the always shaky United Front.

The CPUSA, desirous of the opportunity for a continued fusing of the antiwar and racial issues as a dual central

theme for the strike, met head on with the Trotskyists at the "final plenary session of the conference."

The SWP—YSA "opposed the CP concept of turning the movement into a 'peace and freedom' organization," and preferred to maintain a single central "antiwar" theme.

The CPUSA outmaneuvered their Trotskyist opposition by handing the black caucus—NBAWADU—50 percent of the conference voting power.¹⁵

The SWP's official publication, the *Militant*, states:

This was the same gimmick the CP supported at the National Conference for New Politics Convention last fall.¹⁶

THE SDS POSITION

At the time the call to the Chicago strike conference had been issued in December 1967, the Students for a Democratic Society, largest of the new left student organizations, was already waist deep in its own plan for a campaign of coordinated disturbances throughout the Nation. The SDS militants have designated their disruptive campaign: "Ten Days To Shake the Empire."

The SDS "10 days" venture, April 21–30, 1968, will feature, primarily, "resistance"¹⁷ aimed at draft boards, Army induction centers and campus industrial and military recruiters.

C. Clark Kissinger, former SDS national secretary,¹⁸ and representative of the national leadership faction within SDS, was chairman of the Chicago student strike conference in January 1968. Kissinger's opening minute of silent tribute to the memory of Ernesto Che Guevara, the Castroite revolutionary, is indicative of that group of SDS national officers who wished to link "anti-imperialism" to the "antiwar movement" on a permanent basis. Their advocacy is "disruption and obstruction by whatever means necessary."¹⁹

Regional SDS leaders, on the other hand, are typified by those member organizers who work more closely with the campus chapters and comprise a very vocal second faction within the SDS superstructure.²⁰ This faction sees the current SDS strategy of head-on physical clashes with established authority as a "winless strategy" which has the effect of further isolating campus SDS members from the majority of responsible students. These regional leaders feel that "a mass anti-imperialist student movement" must be built on U.S. campuses; and further, that:

Strong ties between workers and students is absolutely essential for victory.²¹

¹⁵ *The Militant*, February 5, 1968, page 4.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁷ *New Left Notes*, November 13, 1967. (SDS Official Publication.)

¹⁸ 1964–65.

¹⁹ Article: "Institutional Resistance," by Carl Davidson, *New Left Notes*, November 13, 1967. (SDS Official Publication.)

²⁰ While SDS has long prided itself on the announced "autonomy" of its campus chapters, it has, in the past year, despite factionalism, moved ever nearer toward ultimate total control of chapters by the National Council.

²¹ "The December National Council—A Different View," by Alan Spector, Debbie Levenson and Stuart Rose, *New Left Notes*, February 12, 1968. (SDS Official Publication.)

The Communist press reported that the "70 SDS members at the Student Mobilization Conference in Chicago felt the strike proposal will fit in effectively with their plans."²²

In a letter to the Washington Free Press, a Washington, DC-based "underground" newspaper, the SDS top three—Mike Spiegel, national secretary; Bob Pardun, educational secretary; and Carl Davidson, interorganizational secretary—stated:

The National Office [of SDS] will have to coordinate the proposed Student Strike and Weeks of Resistance in the spring.

As of this date, it appears that the larger university SDS chapters will participate—however reluctantly—in the April 26 student strike, especially in the New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles-San Francisco areas.

CONCLUSIONS

The proposal for the April 26, 1968, "students' antiwar, antiracist strike" was originated, promoted and consolidated by Communists.

Likewise, the Chicago strike conference—January 27, 28, 29, 1968—which voted to hold the student strike this spring was controlled and dominated by the Communist Party and W.E.B. DuBois Clubs on the one hand, and the Socialist Workers Party-Young Socialist Alliance on the other hand.

The Communist Party effectively assured the adoption of the "strike" proposal at the Chicago conference by first, assisting in the creation of the National Black Anti-War, Anti-Draft Union—NBAWADU; and second, allotting this group of black militant extremists an unprecedented 50 percent of the total voting power of the conference.

The machinery of the Student Mobilization Committee has been kept intact over the past year, apparently for the express purpose of engineering a massive and well-publicized student strike in the spring of 1968.

The student strike and mass actions day—April 27, 1968—will be the Communist-run vehicles of irresponsible dissent and internal disruption within the United States. This dissent and disruption is designed to benefit the North Vietnamese enemy and the world Communist movement in general by undermining public support of the present U.S. policy of resisting Communist aggression in South Vietnam.

Communist organizations, the Communist press, Communist fronts and individual Communists have drawn together under the banner of the Student Mobilization Committee in a united front. The primary objective of this united front is to defeat American determination of continued support for U.S. policy in Vietnam. As secondary objectives, this united front hopes to, first, depict the U.S. Government as "imperialistic" in its policy of assisting nations which are presently opposing Communist aggression throughout the world; and second, to exploit the current racial tensions in the United States by blaming continuing ghetto problems on the diversion of poverty funds in order to fight Communist

¹⁴ *National Guardian*, February 10, 1968, page 4.

²² *The Worker*, February 4, 1968, page 12.

aggression in Southeast Asia and elsewhere.

If the Communists are successful in inducing a significant number of college and high school students to strike on April 26, 1968, and to partake in the mass disruptive actions on April 27, 1968—for whatever reasons—the international Communist propaganda network will use this incident to attempt to: First, create widespread public demand for reversal of present U.S. foreign policy; second, propagandistically give aid and comfort to Communists everywhere in the world Communist movement, but particularly in Vietnam; and, third, further dampen the resolve of America's allies who presently support U.S. policy in Vietnam, and make the war effort appear solely "America's problem."

BILL INTRODUCED TO PROVIDE FULL GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE AUDIT OF THE FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, for a number of years now, a dispute has continued between the General Accounting Office and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, over the scope of GAO's audit of FDIC.

While to many of us, the law seems perfectly clear that the Congress intended that GAO audit the FDIC to the same extent that GAO audits the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, the FDIC has refused access to bank examination reports. As a result, the GAO has been unable to advise the Congress as to the soundness and adequacy of the FDIC insurance fund.

We in Congress have a tremendous responsibility to assure that the public's deposits and savings in our insured banks are as safe as possible. Vigorous and competent examination by the Federal banking agencies is our first line of defense against bank failures which, unfortunately, are on the rise. In order to evaluate the adequacy and efficiency of FDIC bank examination procedures, as well as the adequacy of the insurance fund, unrestricted GAO access to all bank examination reports in FDIC's possession is necessary. All this was made clear on March 6 when Comptroller General Staats testified before your Banking and Currency Committee as we started hearings on the adequacy of bank supervision.

Thus, it appears that positive legislation is required to clarify the state of the law as to audits of the FDIC. The bill, which I am introducing today for myself, Representatives BARRETT, SULLIVAN, REUSS, GONZALEZ, MINISH, HANNA, GETTYS, ANNUNZIO, REES, BINGHAM, FINO, and WYLIE is quite simple and provides, among other things, that these examination reports acquired by GAO shall be

kept confidential except pursuant to court order or action by the Congress.

This bill, H.R. 16064 is very much in the public interest, and I foresee prompt action by your Banking Committee, Mr. Speaker, after we receive the views of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

The full text is as follows:

H.R. 16064

A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act with respect to the scope of the audit by the General Accounting Office

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. (a) The first sentence of subsection (b) of section 17 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1827(b)) is amended by striking "financial".

(b) The third sentence of that subsection is amended by changing "in use by the Corporation, pertaining to its financial transactions" to read "used by the Corporation, including examination reports of the Federal Reserve banks and the Comptroller of the Currency relied on by the Corporation in making its examination, pertaining to its transactions".

(c) Section 17 of that Act (12 U.S.C. 1827) is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end:

"(e) Any information obtained by the General Accounting Office pursuant to subsection (b) that concerns the operation and financial status of an individual bank shall be confidential and may not be released by the General Accounting Office without prior approval of the Corporation except upon the order of a court of competent jurisdiction, or by direction of the Congress of the United States, or either House thereof, or any committee of Congress or either House duly authorized."

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER SUPPORTS PRESIDENT JOHNSON

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the credentials, experience, and qualifications of various individuals to speak on Vietnam are paramount in a final evaluation of their pertinence, importance, and timing of their testimony. I know of no one more qualified to speak on American involvement in Vietnam than Dwight D. Eisenhower, commander in chief of Allied forces in Europe during World War II, commander of NATO blocking Communist aggression in Western Europe, and President of the United States for 8 years.

The following article contains the most recent statement by General Eisenhower on our involvement in Vietnam. This article appeared in the Washington Evening Star on March 16 and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues and to the attention of every citizen of the United States:

UNITED STATES SEEMS ON RIGHT TRACK IN VIETNAM, EISENHOWER SAYS

Finding a solution to Vietnam is harder than it might be, former President Dwight D. Eisenhower says, because "I don't think

the American people really feel inspired to do anything."

At a news conference near Indio, Calif., Eisenhower said yesterday the United States appeared to be "on the right track" in its conduct of the war.

"We are not trying to destroy North Vietnam," he said. "What we are trying to do is make it too expensive for North Vietnam to try to dominate South Vietnam."

The ex-president met newsmen with Sen. Thomas H. Kuchel, R-Calif., who began a campaign for re-election this week.

OTHER DEVELOPMENTS

In other developments touching on the war:

The Department of Defense reported more than 135,000 soldiers and 41,000 sailors have volunteered for duty in Vietnam since 1965. Neither the Air Force nor the Marine Corps keeps totals on Vietnam volunteers, the Pentagon said.

But figures were available for all services on the numbers of men finishing tours in Vietnam who voluntarily extended six months or more in the 14-month period ending Dec. 31.

Volunteers for extra Vietnam service included: Army, 27,736 enlisted men and 897 officers; Navy, 3,761 enlisted men, officer total unavailable; Air Force, 3,837 enlisted men, officer total unavailable; and Marines, 13,913 enlisted men and 201 officers.

Sen. Charles H. Percy, R-Ill., said direct negotiations for an end to the fighting will have to be conducted with the Viet Cong—not just the North Vietnamese.

WOULD DEAL WITH VIET CONG

"Even if the North Vietnamese did sign an armistice with us," Percy said in an interview in Playboy Magazine, "the VC would carry on anyway, in my judgment, so we've got to deal with them."

Rep. Donald W. Riegle Jr., R-Mich., said the cost for each Viet Cong killed in 1967, in terms of U.S. military expenditures, was \$234,000. American deaths per thousand of enemy killed reached 106.5—"an erosion of the basic 10 to 1 'success ratio' required to win a guerrilla war," he said.

A nonpartisan businessmen's group calling itself Business Executives Move for Vietnam Peace announced it was attempting to enlist the support of business executives all over the nation to oppose "the incredible obsession of a shrinking handful of men with a national mistake in Vietnam."

Sixty-three percent of 33,934 Protestants responding to a poll conducted by denominational magazines said they disapproved of the way President Johnson is handling the war, but their sentiments seemed on the hawkish side. More than half said the United States should use any force short of nuclear weapons to achieve military victory.

THE ONES WHO HAD ENOUGH

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe that any single voice can add much to the comment and counter-comment occasioned by the political developments in the Democratic Party this last week. However, one feels about the timing and the manner the latest contender, Senator ROBERT KENNEDY, entered the lists, there is no question concerning his right to do so. In fact, it speaks well for the system built on free-

dom of choice that the spectrum has been widened.

What is needed, however, Mr. Speaker, is a sober note of caution, if not to those deafened by the call of power or the beck of personal ambition, at least to those who will play dominate roles in the selection processes from now through August. The so-called Vietnam war issue, which I believe is more accurately described as our Southeast Asia or Pacific community policy issue, can be very dangerously misinterpreted and very erroneously articulated to our people.

We have those who equate this issue as simply a division between war and peace, an equation any thoughtful person would discard as an unworthy simplification; those who see the involvement as one to determine the future of one tiny nation—a nation yet to find its own identity. An experienced follower of world events would class such views as myopic. There are those who assess the struggle as a pure confrontation between communism and anticommunism. Any practical person would see this as a not-too-helpful, ideological abstraction of the pragmatic and real happening involving one-third of the population of the earth.

The sobering facts about what power will dominate this important emerging area and what this will do in the 25-year period that lies immediately ahead are the facts that need to be grasped.

The results of approaches suggested by any other candidate do not come to grips with these facts. Are our options widened or in fact narrowed by proposals being offered as alternatives to the present administration's approach? Act with caution, my colleagues. I warn you that particularly the fuzzy proposal of Senator KENNEDY will, in the long run, narrow our options and seriously compromise and burden our future.

Please take time to read and weigh the enclosed lead article from the *London Economist*. In my humble judgment the warnings, carefully stated, as to what could follow our capitulation to an easier road are soundly based. I do not take much comfort in pointing this out. Nor am I enthusiastic about our particular performance in Vietnam nor the clarity of our real objectives or policies in the Pacific community. I am not, because of this, ready to answer the call of the Lorelei and run the dangers lurking in the rocky shoals where facile, well-meaning obstructionists seek to lead us.

America needs to keep its "cool" more than at any other time in history. Listen intently to the divergent views. Watch with great care the total picture of our world politics. Think deeply on the long-term results and fully explore ramifications of what some candidates are suggesting. Do not expect that all problems must have quick solutions. Sometimes when events cannot be contained they will respond only to forces which are persistent, pervasive, and patient. There are people in this world who know and understand this and they are, at this time, your country's enemies.

Mr. Speaker, I include below the referred to article from last week's *Economist*:

THE ONES WHO HAD ENOUGH

General Giap has won half a battle, but he may have won the war. His demonstration of the communists' strength in Vietnam has shaken the Americans and it has brought Senator Robert Kennedy to the brink of challenging President Johnson. Senator Kennedy's calculation on Wednesday night was quite patent. If 42 per cent of the voters in the Democratic primary in New Hampshire think Senator McCarthy is right about Vietnam, it is clear that many Americans have become very tired of this war. This is Giap's doing. Two months ago in New Hampshire Senator McCarthy seemed unlikely to get more than 10 per cent or 15 per cent of the Democratic vote.

The attack General Giap launched on January 30th has failed to make a permanent lodgment in any of South Vietnam's towns. He has not yet attempted an assault on Khe Sanh or on any other position that the Americans hold in strength. But since January 30th General Giap has trebled the weekly roll of American casualties, and he has trebled Senator McCarthy's vote. He has shown Senator Kennedy his chance. The last few weeks have struck at the heart of the matter: at the Americans' willingness to go on paying this sort of price without a visible assurance that it will buy them victory in the reasonably near future. Senator McCarthy's 42 per cent is the vote of decent and troubled people for whom Vietnam seems a far-away country on the margin of America's national interest: a country that is just not worth it.

It is conceivable that Tuesday's vote exaggerates the extent of the swing against the war. Some of that 42 per cent may have been Democrats who dislike President Johnson as a man more than they dislike the Vietnam war. Others may have been Republicans and independents jumping into the Democratic primary for the pleasure of putting a boot into Mr. Johnson. Those are straws for Mr. Johnson to cling to. But it is more likely that the New Hampshire vote shows what the last six weeks have done to the self-confidence of people all over the United States. In that case there are only two things that can restore their confidence in Mr. Johnson's conduct of the war. One is for General Giap to risk a direct test of arms against a large American force, at Khe Sanh or elsewhere, and get beaten. The other is for the Americans and their allies to use some of the troops they have got clustered in and around the towns to reassert their control over some of the rural areas they have lost since January 30th.

If the Americans can bring either of these things off they may find that public opinion at home will recover its confidence after all: the New Hampshire primary may go down in the record books as the wince before the gritting of the teeth. But if either of these things is to happen it will have to happen soon, and it will have to be done with the forces that General Westmoreland has available to him now. The large reserves that General Westmoreland would like Mr. Johnson to call up are unlikely to make much difference in Vietnam before the year's end. That will be too late for Mr. Johnson. He may not get nominated by his party in August, and if he is nominated he will very likely not get elected in November, unless he can even the score with Giap this spring and summer. The New Hampshire voters have set the stopwatch: they have told him how long he has got.

If the Americans in Vietnam cannot recover some of the ground lost since January, and do it soon, the presidential election will burst wide open. The anti-war vote collected by Senator McCarthy has now brought Senator Kennedy to his moment of truth. It may be that, when he looks at it coldly, Senator Kennedy will draw back from a challenge to Mr. Johnson that could destroy both men

and put the Democrats out of power for half a generation. But Senator Kennedy, for all his qualities, is not his brother. His ambition and intellectual calculation may outrun his judgment. He will find it hard, having now gone back on his previous support for Mr. Johnson, to slide back into being a non-candidate again. It is not impossible that by the autumn the world may again be watching a Kennedy fighting a Nixon for the presidency. And this in turn will have its effect on Mr. Nixon's position. The swing against the war increases the chance that Governor Rockefeller will try to snatch the Republican nomination away from him even at this late stage. To prevent this happening, Mr. Nixon will presumably feel obliged to modify his previous support for the war.

This is what could happen in the United States. What will have happened in Vietnam, if the Americans cannot reassert themselves, is that they will find that General Giap has painted them into a corner. They will have been forced, by his superior generalship, into the "enclave strategy" that some armchair strategists last year were telling them to adopt of their own free will. Now that they are stuck in their enclaves the disadvantages of this strategy are painfully obvious. It leaves the communists free to strike wherever they want. It puts them within rocket range of many American airfields and supply dumps. It lets them press new recruits into service from the parts of the countryside the allies have abandoned. This is not a strategy that anyone in his right mind would choose. It is a defending general's nightmare. If the defenders cannot fight their way out of their enclaves by the summer they will either have to do it with a bigger army next year—but will the United States still have a President who is ready to go on fighting next year?—or negotiate from inside the noose. Mr. Johnson might try to negotiate on those terms himself. But it is pretty clear what sort of settlement that would produce. If negotiations take place as things stand now, with Giap's men sitting around the towns, it is hard to see how the communists can be prevented from taking a position in the postwar structure of South Vietnam that will give them command of the country within five years.

It is up to the Americans. *The Economist* does not wish to join those who are telling the Americans that they have been following the wrong policy in Vietnam for the past decade. It may be that the policy involves a price they no longer choose to pay; it has certainly run into great difficulties. But the reasons why the policy was adopted by President Eisenhower and continued by his successors have not vanished. Let it be said again. There can be no compromise solution in South Vietnam. The country will be run after the war either under a communist system or under a non-communist one. If the communists succeed in imposing their system, having beaten an American army by the technique of guerrilla war, it is folly to suppose that this will be an event without consequences. Once General Giap's men have got things fixed in Vietnam they can knock off the non-communist government in Laos with a flick of their little finger. It will be curious if they do not help Cambodia's communists to do the same in that country too: look at what Prince Sihanouk has been saying lately about the rebellion in his western provinces. And there are communist insurrections in Thailand, Malaysia and Burma, all in some degree under the control of North Vietnam or China.

The calculations of the men who are running these rebellions—and of the men who are opposing them—will inevitably be affected by what happens in Vietnam. And so will the calculations of other men far away from south-east Asia. Mr. Brezhnev and Mr. Kosygin have taken some risks to stand up against the Chinese argument that guerrilla

war can beat "the imperialists" anywhere. They have plenty of opponents, in Russia and in the communist movement abroad, who will be happy to claim that if the guerrilla technique works in Asia it can work in Africa and Latin America too. The Soviet Union's leaders will almost certainly slide into a more adventurous foreign policy after an American defeat in Vietnam. They can doubtless see the dangers. But the pressure will be on them, from any part of the world where there is a communist party with a claim on their allegiance and a would-be Giap who thinks he can pull off another "war of national liberation."

These are the dangers in an American defeat. It would have been the same if the Americans had ducked the issue in Vietnam in 1961 or 1965. The same people would have drawn the same conclusions. The challenges would have kept on coming up. The Americans might have found a better place to face them; but it would have been a long way farther down the road. It is now up to them. They know that, unless General Westmoreland can restore the balance in the next few months, they will be back to where they were in 1966: the only difference will be that the war is bigger and nastier. They know what the cost would then be of putting things right: in the casualty lists, in money, and in the agony of watching it happen on television. But on the other side is the danger of a major erosion in the position of the only non-communist superpower: an erosion that would coincide (see page 85) with an erosion of the international monetary balance that has kept capitalism flourishing since 1945. These are great issues. No outsider can ask more than that, having examined what it would mean to accept defeat and what it would mean to carry on, the Americans should make their decision plain this summer and autumn. That is what a democracy is about. If the Americans emerge from Vietnam with nothing else, they can at least say they took their decision the democratic way.

FEDERAL REGULATIONS OF LOBBYING ACT

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks today, I include for the RECORD our Republican task force comparison of title V of the Senate-passed and other reorganization bills.

Title V comprises amendments to the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act. The material I am inserting covers all of the sections under this title of the reorganization bill:

TITLE V—REGULATION OF LOBBYING

Sec. 501. Definition of Comptroller General.

Sec. 502. Multipurpose contributions and expenditures.

Sec. 503. Five-year preservation of records.

Sec. 504. Substantial purpose controlling.

Sec. 505. Contingent fees; broadcasting.

Sec. 506. Administration by Comptroller General.

Sec. 507. Violation of regulations.

Title V consists entirely of amendments to the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act (U.S.C. 2, chap. 8A), enacted as Title III of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

Title V was not amended in any respect by the Senate. However, extensive debate occurred over an amendment to strike the entire title from the reorganization bill. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 113, part 4,

pages 5341, 5342, 5377, 5569, and part 5, pages 5643-5660. The amendment was offered by Sen. Hruska, carried a further amendment by Mr. Griffin, and was defeated 30 to 53 on a roll call vote.

COMPARISONS

Print No. 3 is identical in all sections to S. 355.

The Bolling and Reid bills, identical to each other except for one paragraph in Sec. 506(b) (a technical matter), differ significantly from S. 355.

In addition, a draft amendment prepared on behalf of Mr. Smith (Calif.) and Mr. Curtis would amend the Senate-passed bill at certain points in connection with the new Joint Committee on Congressional Operations and would amend S. 355 language with respect to the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act.

SECTIONS 501, 503, AND 506

S. 355, Sec. 501 (definition), in conjunction with Sec. 506, transfers the administration of the Lobbying Act from the Clerk of the House to the Comptroller General.

Sec. 503 requires that statements filed under the Lobbying Act shall be retained for five rather than two years. (See Item 6 below.)

Sec. 506 confers on the Comptroller General the following powers and duties in connection with the amended Lobbying Act:

ITEMS

(1) to prescribe forms and regulations for its administration;

(2) to make available for public inspection all reports and statements filed under the Act;

(3) to ascertain whether any persons have failed to file reports as required, or have filed incomplete or inaccurate reports, and to notify such persons accordingly;

(4) to refer to the Department of Justice for appropriate action "any information coming to his attention, through complaints or otherwise, of any failure to register, or the filing of any false, improper, or incomplete registration or information under this title;"

(5) to make such studies and transmit to Congress such recommendations as the Comptroller General deems necessary in further carrying out the objectives of the Act;

(6) to retain reports for 5 years (see Sec. 503 above) and make them available for public inspection; and

(7) to make an annual report to Congress on administration of the Act.

Bolling. Sections 501, 503, and 506 in Bolling are parallel to S. 355 except that—

Wherever S. 355 reads "Comptroller General," Bolling substitutes "Attorney General" of the U.S.;

The Attorney General shall "review for appropriate action any information," etc. per Item 4 above;

A new item provides that the Attorney General shall supply the ethics committee of each house with copies of material furnished him under Item 4; and

Whereas the Comptroller General in S. 355 is to make an annual report to Congress on administration of the Act (see Item 7), in Bolling the Attorney General is to make such annual report to the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate, and this report "shall be made public immediately" upon its transmission.

Reid. Identical to Bolling in all respects except that Reid provides for a Joint Committee on Ethics and Conduct (see under Title I), to which shall be sent copies of information per Item 4 (instead of to the separate ethics committees in each house).

Print No. 3. Identical to S. 355 in all respects.

NOTE. See Final Report page 53:

"3. Lobby registration information shall be filed with the General Accounting Office, rather than the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate. It shall be the responsibility of GAO to—

"(a) Maintain the registrations as public records for a 5-year period.

"(b) Deliver to the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate quarterly records for publication in the Congressional Record.

"(c) Analyze registration information and deliver to the Congress an annual report on lobbying activities.

"(d) Refer complaints of failure to register or false or improper registrations to the Department of Justice for appropriate action."

SECTION 502

S. 355. Section 502 (taken in conjunction with the amendment made by Sec. 504) provides that *where contributions are received or expenditures made in part for lobbying purposes and in part for any other purposes*, the statements required to be filed by persons engaging in lobbying activities shall include only the portions thereof devoted to lobbying purposes, "except that if the relative proportions cannot be ascertained with reasonable certainty," *such statements shall show total receipts and expenditures together with an estimate by the registrant of the part thereof which was for lobbying purposes, and the part thereof which was for other purposes.*

Bolling. Same (with substitution of Attorney General for Comptroller General).

Reid. Same.

Print No. 3. Same.

NOTE. See Final Report page 53:

"2. Organizations which contend that it is impossible for them to separate expenditures for lobbying purposes—and which have influencing of legislation as a substantial purpose—shall be required to file their total receipts and expenditures under oath and estimate the percentage properly allocable to lobbying activities."

SECTION 504

S. 355. Under the present Lobbying Act, reporting requirements apply to any person who solicits or receives money or other consideration "to be used principally to aid or the principal purpose of which person is to aid" the influencing of the passage or defeat of legislation. Sec. 504 of the reorganization bill amends that section of the Act to apply to any person who solicits or receives money or other consideration "a substantial part of which is to be used to aid, or a substantial purpose of which person is to aid" in lobbying.

Bolling. Same.

Reid. Same.

Print No. 3. Same.

NOTE. See Final Report pages 52-53:

"1. The provision requiring registration by those who have as 'their principal purpose' the influencing of the passage or defeat of legislation shall be amended to require registration by those having such activity as a 'substantial purpose.'"

SECTION 505

S. 355. Amends the Lobbying Act to require full disclosure of contingent fee arrangements.

Additionally, this section amends the Act to place broadcasting on a parity with the press in regard to both exemptions and reporting requirements.

Bolling. Same, with substitution of Attorney General for Comptroller General.

Reid. Same as Bolling.

Print No. 3. Same.

NOTE. See Final Report pages 54 and 55:

"4. Individuals registering under the act who are to receive contingent fees for lobbying activities shall be required to state the terms of the fee in detail. This disclosure shall include a specific description of the legislation on which the fee is contingent and any other events which would affect the payment of all or any portion of the fee."

"5. The exemptions under the act applicable to newspapers and periodicals shall be

extended to include the television and radio media."

SECTION 507

S. 355. Amends the penalty section of the Lobbying Act to make the violation of the regulations of the Comptroller General under the Act a misdemeanor punishable by a fine not exceeding \$5,000 or imprisonment not exceeding 12 months or both.*

Bolling. Same (Attorney General instead of Comptroller General).

Reid. Same as Bolling.

Print No. 3. Same as S. 355.

SMITH-CURTIS DRAFT

Compare the following with Sections 501, 503, and 506 of S. 355 and the other bills.

A. Instead of to the Comptroller General (S. 355 and Print No. 3), or to the Attorney General (Bolling and Reid), the Smith-Curtis Draft transfers administration of the Lobbying Act to the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations.

B. The Joint Committee shall—

(1) retain lobby statements for five instead of two years (same as S. 355);

(2) issue regulations after notice and hearing, such regulations to be published in the Congressional Record and in the U.S. Code as a note to the appropriate title (*new material*);

(3) make lobby statements available for public inspection (same as S. 355);

(4) notify the Justice Department of failures to register (under S. 355, the Comptroller General notifies such persons direct);

(5) notify the Justice Department of false, improper, or incomplete filings (appears same as S. 355);

(6) study and report to Congress on possible improvements in the Act (*not* stated in this Title but conferred upon the Joint Committee under Amendments to Title IV of Smith-Curtis Draft; in intent, the provision is the same as S. 355);

(7) make an annual report to Congress on administration of the Act (same as S. 355).

Reference to Section 502: Whereas S. 355 requires that when organizations cannot "with reasonable accuracy" separate lobbying expenditures from expenditures for other purposes they shall file total receipts and expenditures plus an estimate of that portion used for lobbying purposes and this information shall be available for public inspection, the Smith-Curtis Draft would require only that the estimates be available for public inspection, *not* the total receipts and expenditures unless so ordered by the Joint Committee.

Reference to Section 504, which substitutes "substantial purpose" for the old "principal purpose" definition—the Smith-Curtis Draft contains some different wording but is to all intents and purposes the same as S. 355 in this respect.

Reference to Section 505 re contingent fees and exemptions for broadcasting media. The Smith-Curtis Draft flatly prohibits contingent fees. The exemptions for broadcasting are same as S. 355.

Reference to Section 507 re violations. Same as S. 355.

IN DEFENSE OF THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my re-

*This section of the bill also repeals a provision of the Act which made it a felony for any person to engage in lobbying within 3 years after having been convicted of a violation of the Act. This provision has already been nullified by a Supreme Court decision which found it unconstitutional, and thus its repeal is technical only. The same in all four bills.

marks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, almost daily we hear of attacks being made upon the U.S. Supreme Court by well-intentioned but woefully misinformed citizens. We have heard remarks highly critical of the Court made by Members of this House; we read of law-enforcement officials blaming their troubles upon the Court; and, saddest of all, we often hear attorneys joining in the attacks and repeating totally false and emotional statements that the Supreme Court is "tying the hands of the police" or is "coddling criminals" at the expense of "decent members of society."

Members of the bar particularly have a positive duty to defend the Supreme Court against these unfortunate attacks. It is possible to question the wisdom of a particular decision without challenging the integrity of the Court as an institution.

I was therefore pleased, Mr. Speaker, to read a recent speech by Judge Donald P. Lay of the U.S. Court of Appeals made before the International Academy of Trial Lawyers. I will include the remarks of Judge Lay in the body of the RECORD. It is hoped that all Members will study this speech and will accept the challenge of Judge Lay to renew publicly their faith in the law and in the courts of this land. The speech follows:

LAW AND ORDER: DUE PROCESS OF LAW 1968 (Speech by Judge Donald P. Lay, U.S. Court of Appeals, Eighth Circuit)

In Plato's dialogue the question is asked: "What is there greater than the word that persuades judges in their courts, or the senators in the councils, or the citizens in the assembly, or at any other political meeting?" I am confident that the distinguished membership of this formidable array would acknowledge upon reflection: "No greater power hath man ever possessed." Never before in the history of man's continual efforts to avoid annihilation has communicative reasoning reached its present day to day importance. Ethical proof of this is readily observed within the recent debate at the feet of the World's Council concerning the Near and Far East conflicts. Failure of peaceful discussion to prevent bloodshed does not negate its force, but on the contrary confirms its truth. Without hope in the persuasion of the spoken or written word man has lost his only chance for survival. It is thus the resolution of conflicting interests by rule of law which gives our brief lives that transcendence which defines the true meaning of a lawyer's work.

The Spirit of Liberty began the pulse beat of this Nation when 180 years ago a few men perceived that government could not survive by human judgment alone. The debates which preceded the adoption of the Constitution recognized that though all men were to be free and equal, that equality had many different connotations to different men. View for example the pluralistic concept in Article IV, Section 3, Paragraph 3 and Article I, Section 2, Paragraph 3 of the Constitution where "free persons" are contrasted with "all other persons" or Article IV that dealt with fugitive slaves which read "no person held to service . . . in one state . . . escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service." Even our fore-

fathers viewed justice in terms of their own relative position. Times have not changed. The adversary trial exemplifies that as long as human judgment remains fallible justice will always take on whatever horizons a litigant's rose-colored glasses desire. I doubt if any of you have ever had a satisfied client who lost his case; at least I was never that fortunate.

Robert Schyler, in 1923, remarked that our Constitution was "a product of human experience; not of abstract reason." Schyler referred to the period of the Revolution and the events which preceded it, but apropos as such a maxim may be, the reasoning behind it falls short of the true historical significance involved. Long before the summer of 1787, men craved some means of assurance that their resort to Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness would not turn upon another man's subjective concept of justice and fair play.

Although the quest for such assurance undoubtedly started long before 1215 A.D., history records its genesis with King John's meeting with the barons at Runnimead with their presentation of the Magna Charta. The 39th chapter of the Charta, perhaps the most well known, reads: "No freeman shall be taken, or imprisoned, or disseised, or outlawed, or exiled, or in any way destroyed, nor will we go upon him, nor will we send upon him, except by the legal judgment of his peers or by the law of the land." In essence the Magna Charta was looked upon as Arthur Sutherland describes, "a welcome assurance that people could set some limitation on the arbitrary powers of the King." Thereafter in English history there came the challenge by Parliament against the two Stuarts. This is documented in the Petition of Right of 1628, which became the impetus for the end of Star Chamber inquisitions in 1641. Perhaps the most modern mark of inheritance from the Petition of Right is today's recognition that men are to be discharged from unjust imprisonment upon habeas corpus. The final recorded event of significance within English history was the Revolution against the restored Stuarts and the passage by Parliament of the English "Bill of Rights" in 1689. Thus documentary evidence preserves man's emergence toward government by consent of the governed.

It is then fair to say that within the background of the Constitutional Convention is actually the entire history of man's search for an adequate safeguard or prophylaxis against abusive government. Alexander Hamilton long ago framed the dilemma when he said: "Too much power leads to despotism, too little leads to anarchy and both eventually to the ruin of the people." Hamilton, as many of you know, opposed a Bill of Rights, since he felt the Constitution itself was a Bill of Rights. However, Thomas Jefferson countered that "a Bill of Rights is what the people are entitled to against every government on earth, general or particular and what no just government should refuse or rest on inference."

Well, where does all this take us—this synoptic course, if you will, in government? Perhaps it is refreshing to some simply to recall that which is so often not understood: that we are a society who have contracted with the rule of law; that we are not controlled by the subjective will of the majority or by an equation of justice by those placed in positions of trust to govern us. But assuredly this is not a lesson to properly bring before trained men proficient in the profession of law itself. I would like to agree, but today's circumstances forewarn that perhaps we all need to go back to basic fundamentals to reassess our proper goals. The lawyer's preoccupation with serving his individual client in getting a verdict or in meeting overhead ignores the public doubt, or for lack of time to investigate he recklessly joins the attack being made on the law itself.

King John's experiences with the baronage at Runnymede, Charles Stuart's death sentence before a high court of justice in 1649, as well as James II's abdication forty years later in the face of the English Bill of Rights, all relate a fundamental truth; a truth demonstrated at Bunker Hill, which is simply stated: the survival of any law must always depend upon the voluntary assent of the people it governs.

When law must be enforced by police coercion of the state, understanding and reason are supplanted for power or force. Force then governs, not law, for the law has failed and man's action is no longer controlled by peaceful assent to lawful interdiction. He then only understands coercive force.

Violation of law may occur for various reasons. Some people may feel that the law is unjust, such as our modern students of civil disobedience sometimes reason, or others disobey it because they have not learned to live within it. In either case, disobedience, civil or criminal, is brought about simply because people have not been taught to respect and cherish the rule of law. And the postulate then becomes self-evidence: that those who are taught to doubt do so because they do not know safely what to believe.

In 1954 the beloved Mr. Justice Felix Frankfurter explained: "Broadly speaking the chief reliance of law in a democracy is the habit of popular respect for law. Especially true is it that law as promulgated by the Supreme Court ultimately depends upon confidence of the people in the Supreme Court as an institution. Indispensable, therefore, for the country's welfare is an appreciation of what the nature of the enterprise is in which that court is engaged—an understanding of what the task is that has been committed to the succession of nine men." Justice Frankfurter made this statement on April 22, 1954, before the American Philosophical Society. On May 17, 1954, the newly appointed Chief Justice Earl Warren handed down the Court's now famous school segregation cases, declaring the old doctrine of "separate but equal" inherently unequal. The Court ordered that Negro students be admitted to white schools in the states of Kansas, South Carolina, Virginia, Delaware and within the District of Columbia.

Shortly thereafter began the most volatile criticism of the Court since the days of President Roosevelt's court packing plan or even comparable to the divisive attacks made in 1857 after Chief Justice Taney's *Dred Scott* decision. In 1954, 96 Southern Congressmen joined in resolution by stating: "The decision of the Supreme Court in the school cases is clear abuse of judicial power. The original Constitution does not mention education neither does the Fourteenth Amendment or any other amendment." The aftermath of that Court's historic decision is present history. While Southern Governors defiantly refused to accept the rule of law, and force on extreme occasion supplanted it, the Supreme Court was sitting on another bombshell. In District No. 9 in New Hyde Park, New York, every day each class read aloud, in the presence of their teacher, an innocent, but simple prayer: "Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon thee and we beg thy blessings upon us, our parents, our parents, our teachers and our country." Only Mr. Justice Stewart dissented as the Court held that the prayer was impermissible as violating the Establishment Clause of the Constitution. Shortly thereafter the Court declared school opening exercises consisting of a voluntary recital of the Lord's Prayer and voluntary reading of passages from the Bible as being equally unconstitutional.

This was too much. Letters swarmed Washington and Congress. Legislative hearings began to consider a constitutional amendment. However, in cool reflection numerous

religious leaders in 1964 opposed a House Judiciary Committee's study to tamper with the First Amendment. Nevertheless, last year a nation-wide poll indicated that the American public was still more disturbed over the school prayer decisions than any other decision.

As criticism began to mount, the Court began to bring within focus a long overdue recognition of procedural due process within state criminal proceedings. Perhaps with Runnymede in mind, Mr. Justice Frankfurter observed in 1943, in *McNabb v. United States*, 318 U.S. 332, 347: "The history of liberty has largely been the history of observance of procedural safeguards." Thus, in 1961 began a series of cases concerning which the average layman has been told turned murderers loose cell block at a time, prevented police from seizing evidence of the crime, strengthened Mafia control of the country, allowed a retrenchment of morality by the flood of obscene literature in the mails, protected juvenile delinquents and now, just recently, all gamblers as well as all criminals who own sawed off shotguns. Within this background, one can read in the newspapers at home or overhear at the drug store or barber shop, or perhaps even at a Bar Association meeting, that the Supreme Court has now become not only "godless" but disloyal as well. Without any consideration of First Amendment principles or of the facts or law involved, newspapers headline that the High Court has struck down laws which proscribe Communists from working in our defense plants, Communists from serving on our merchant vessels or teaching in our schools. And as if to put frosting on the cake for those who have in disgraceful tones endorsed the impeachment of Chief Justice Earl Warren, we find renewed attacks by Congressmen that the Court has entered the political arena by disturbing the historic control of state legislators and congressional districts under the reapportionment decisions of *Reynolds v. Sims*, *Baker v. Carr* and *Wesberry v. Sanders*.

I would submit the average American today is being taught more infectious contempt and disrespect for the law through the dissemination of constant misinformation and unqualified criticism than ever before in our Nation. I suggest to you a simple but troubling truth: that a representative form of government cannot prevail in a society which thrives upon benighted ignorance. Emotional headlines and sermons daily reach the ears of the average American to understand, offered by persons who do not attempt to understand themselves. These headlines even affect lawyers who do not bother to understand or read the cases themselves. Recently a state legislator who theoretically graduated from a law school in a Midwestern state approached me and told me that he was happy that I was on the Court of Appeals and not the Supreme Court, because it would be almost an impossible burden if I had to follow the decisions of that particular Court.

How many of your children read Little Orphan Annie in the newspaper? A few months ago I read where Annie was talking to her dog Sandy about a poor fellow in a wheel chair, and says: "So he got crippled and lost everything; the cops caught the monster and he confessed and the court turned him loose. Oh, brother!"

I read a sermon the other day where a minister is talking on law and morals, and suddenly turns upon the Supreme Court with a vicious attack by saying it represents "the malignant moral tolerance of the public." The minister concludes "what a sad commentary it is on the morals of a Nation when its Supreme Court is more interested in the constitutional rights of criminals than in the inalienable rights of the people to Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness." I wonder how many persons in that congregation came away with respect for law and its courts

that Sunday? This sermon demonstrated the total lack of understanding of what issues were involved. I am confident from his text that his opinion was formed from headlines of a newspaper and not from reading the opinions themselves. For these words of these great justices reflect a greater love and appreciation for law, liberty and morality than any such "harbinger of doom" could ever comprehend.

Do the headlines give the public confidence in the rule of law and the courts of this country? I wonder how many more in that particular congregation would have been assured if the law had been praised and explained, if the Supreme Court had been upheld as a great Court, in fact as one of the greatest of all times, would the people have had more respect for the law? Would we gain understanding and respect for law and order if information media would better explain the basic principles and reasons behind the decisions so the public could understand what the case is really about and why the result had been reached? Let me give you an example.

What if your 15 year old son was arrested and you were not notified of his arrest until late at night. You find he is in jail because a neighbor lady charged he used abusive, adolescent, offensive language to her over the telephone. Assume the Juvenile Court holds an informal hearing while you are out of town and only your wife is present, the neighbor lady is not called to testify, and the boy denies he used the foul language on the telephone but says another youngster did. You are not notified of any formal charges and all of a sudden the juvenile judge sends you a letter saying your boy is delinquent and he is sentenced to the State Reformatory until he is 21. In other words, a sentence for six years, whereas if an adult had been found guilty of the same offense the maximum confinement would have been 60 days. There is no appeal to the State Supreme Court from such an order. The boy was denied, because he was a juvenile: (1) notice of charges, (2) right of counsel, (3) right to confront complaining witnesses and cross examination, (4) privilege against self-incrimination, (5) right to a transcript of the informal hearing, and (6) right to appellate review.

Do you feel this is the kind of justice you want in America? Yet this happened to Gerald Gault, a 15 year old in Arizona recently. On May 15, 1967, the Supreme Court reversed this commitment as violative of the due process clause. The Court simply followed a well-founded guide for juvenile courts called "Standards For Juvenile And Family Courts" and the Report of the President's Crime Commission, which recommends: "Counsel should be appointed as a matter of course whenever coercive action is a possibility, without requiring any affirmative choice by child or parent." Yet the Supreme Court was severely criticized by certain members of the press as once again coddling criminals and thwarting criminal justice. Where do you stand? I'll tell you where you would stand if this ever happened to your son.

Judge Pound of the New York Court of Appeals made the statement sometime ago that best summarizes the concern with due process in criminal procedure when he said: "Although the defendant may be the worst of men the rights of the best of men are secure only as the rights of the most violent and most abhorrent are protected." I wonder if it would not cast some light if lawyers and judges, who profess to understand the law, could respond to informal criticism of the Supreme Court by paraphrasing Judge Pound saying, that we should all remember "that the rights of the best of men are secure only as long as the rights of the worst of men are protected."

Dean Pollock of Yale University Law School observes: "The community that falls

to insist on scrupulous observance of high standards of its police, by its prosecutors and by its judges and juries has surrendered responsibility for its most awesome institutions, such a community has lost track of the purposes which brought it into existence."

How easily these principles are forgotten or set aside in the emotional hysteria when the reckless headline is read. How hastily the average person forgets our basic heritage of the English experience and the proposition that every man is first presumed to be innocent, however guilty he may prove to be upon due inquiry. And that with this presumption of innocence it becomes the duty of every court to see that persons accused are denied no essential of fair trial or fair investigation.

Mapp v. Ohio, in 1961, barred state convictions premised upon evidence illegally obtained. Then came *Gideon's* trumpet which guaranteed the right of counsel to all persons charged with a felony, followed by *Malloy* with the application of the Fifth Amendment's principle of self-incrimination to the state defendant. These decisions immediately brought public denunciation of their own basic Bill of Rights. The *Gideon* case at the time was considered to be the most controversial. Thereafter many state prisoners complained they were deprived of their constitutional rights by failure of the state to provide them with right of counsel. The *Gideon* rule was held to be retroactive and in many states problems of procedure and retrial were reluctantly faced by state officials. Our court recently held last year in an en banc hearing that the State of Missouri had to provide right of counsel on appeal retroactively to all defendants convicted wherein counsel had been routinely denied the indigent on appeal.

However, in 1964 before the furor got off the ground, along came *Escobedo* and then finally the *Miranda* cases, which have all been so highly publicized. These cases further extended federal standards to state officers. In *Miranda* it was specifically spelled out that incommunicado interrogation of individuals in a police-dominated atmosphere resulting in self incriminatory statements without forewarnings of constitutional rights would not be acceptable.

Perhaps the basic misunderstanding relates to the Fifth Amendment and the privilege of self-incrimination. As Mr. Justice Frankfurter said in 1955: "No doubt the constitutional privilege may on occasion save a guilty man from his just desserts. It was aimed at a more far-reaching evil, a recurrence of the inquisition in the Star Chamber, even if not in their stark brutality. Prevention of the greater evil was deemed of more importance than occurrence of the lesser evil. Having had much experience with a tendency in human nature to abuse power, the founders sought to close the doors against like future abuses by law enforcing agencies." The same fundamental principles were at stake when the High Court struck down just a few weeks ago the gambling stamp tax and the requirement of registration for certain firearms under the National Firearms Act. Typical of the reaction was an editorial in a Midwestern newspaper the day after the decision came down. Quoting from the AP dispatch, the paper indicated that Chief Justice Warren dissented because he could not understand the reasoning of the majority. The paper editorialized that "we cannot understand the majority's reasoning either." I submit that the editors of the newspaper did not attempt to understand it because they didn't attempt to read it. The slip sheet opinion did not arrive in the mail until two days after the editorial was printed. The Chief Justice's dissent was on a legal basis and for what he considered proper legal reasoning. The eight judges of the majority disagreed, finding encroachment

upon our basic Bill of Rights in forcing any accused to incriminate himself. But these principles were never conveyed to the public.

A few voices in the dark shamefully acclaim that crime is caused or that criminal convictions are decreased because of the opinions of the Supreme Court of the United States. Those who voice such protests relating to federal prosecutions present puzzling causes. Their argument is difficult to rationally accept since the effect of these recent cases is merely to apply through the Fourteenth Amendment to the states what federal officers have been following for many years. I submit that any such person must disagree with Ramsey Clark, the Attorney General of the United States and J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Mr. Hoover's statement made in 1955 was cited by Chief Justice Warren in *Miranda* as to the practice the F.B.I. follows today in criminal investigations. Mr. Hoover stated:

"Law enforcement, however, in defeating the criminal, must maintain inviolate the historic liberties of the individual. To turn back the criminal, yet by so doing, destroy the dignity of the individual, would be a hollow victory.

"We can have the Constitution, the best laws in the land, and the most honest reviews by courts—but unless the law enforcement profession is steeped in the democratic tradition, maintains the highest in ethics, and makes its work a career of honor, civil liberties will continually—and without end—be violated. . . . The best protection of civil liberties is an alert, intelligent and honest law enforcement agency. There can be no alternative."

Within the recent cases dealing with the principles of the First, Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Amendments, as now incorporated into the Fourteenth Amendment, is the one basic concept of "Fundamental fairness" when applied to criminal procedures before, during and after trial. These fundamental rights are guaranteed to you, or your wife, or your child, or your client, not because some judge equitably feels you are entitled to them in an individual case, but because there exists an irrepealable document called the Constitution of the United States.

Despite the clamor of a few disenchanted prosecutors and attorney generals, in my opinion, *Miranda*, and its progenitors are having a tremendous impact upon the effectiveness and dignity of law enforcement in the United States. A recent study done by the Yale Law School, as released in their July 1967 Law Journal, exhausts the overall area. It was carried on with the cooperation of all the police officials of New Haven, Connecticut, a city of 150,000. The study reaches certain conclusions that are rather interesting to consider: (1) That questioning was necessary to solve a crime in less than 10% of the felony cases in which an arrest was made. (2) That warnings have little impact upon a suspect's behavior; that if the suspect wants to talk he will do so notwithstanding the warning. (3) That if a lawyer is contacted before interrogation he can become a substantial aid to the suspect. The report states that the lawyer's presence does not affect the outcome in most cases in terms of a judgment of guilty or not guilty, but he can substantially better the suspect's chances of an opportunity to plead to a reduced charge or of receiving a favorable sentence after a guilty plea; and he can safeguard the rights of the innocent. (4) That the impact of *Miranda* and its predecessors has had an important and salutary effect upon the police. (a) They realize that their actions are subject to review and that they do not create the rules of interrogation. (b) That thorough investigations are being carried on to obtain corroborative evidence for trial.

In retrospect, I find it alarming that the majority of well-intentioned people view the Bill of Rights as hallowed ground only when

infrequently applied. Notwithstanding faith in a democratic majority, one can readily find in recent history instances where popular majorities have been defiant to the rights of minorities. James Madison and Thomas Jefferson insisted upon a written Bill of Rights which could permanently withstand despotic majority wills. The Judicial Branch of government became the only mechanism by which these rights could be protected and in this sense the courts became the guardians of the peoples' individual rights. History records that indeed the original Constitution would not have been ratified had it not been for the faith that it would be so amended to include a Bill of Rights. Thus our forefathers saw that constitutional liberty would always be in peril unless established by irrevocable rule. As Mr. Justice Davis wrote in *Ex parte Milligan*, "the Constitution of the United States is a law for rulers and people equally in war and in peace and covers with it the shield of its protection all classes of men at all times and under all circumstances."

A government is only as strong as the moral fiber of its people. Any government is only worth having as long as it can openly tolerate dissent and free channels of expression. Once we fear the extremes of associations or speech then we acknowledge the weakness of our own bond. Once we suppress minority rights in favor of the emotion of the crowd, we unwittingly sacrifice the majority's interest. If, in the name of justice, we are willing to let the end justify the means, let convictions be the goal at any cost, deprive the indigent and the unknowing of the right of counsel, overlook illegal intrusion of government into our homes and privacy, have loose standards of proper arrest and arraignment, allow police inquisition and trickery (an Attorney General of a Midwestern state told a Senate Subcommittee that he believed in using trickery to get confessions), I ask when this occurs do we really protect the interest of society as a whole. History's lesson teaches that the rights of the many are only secure as long as the very least individual right is sacrosanct from abuse.

Criticism of the Supreme Court is not new. Mr. Justice Holmes said a long time ago, such skepticism should be taken philosophically, but he added: "We should try to see what we can learn from hatred and distrust for the attacks upon the court are merely an expression of the unrest that seems to wonder vaguely whether law and order pay." Law and order in our democratic society requires a profound and grateful respect for law enforcement authorities, but simultaneously we must all demonstrate a reverential acknowledgment that the rule of law must govern mankind or we retreat to the totalitarian atmosphere of a paternalistic government.

The American lawyer holds in trust the great heritage of the law itself. When he publicly condemns it or its institutions he desecrates that heritage. This is not to say that the lawyer does not have a right to disagree with the law, but in debating it we should not allow the public to miscomprehend our adversary tradition as a charge of disrespect. We owe an obligation as keepers of the light to better inform, to enlighten if you will, the public as to the law, the reasons of the law, the basic liberties and democratic tenets at stake in the opinions of all courts. Today the American lawyer is failing that trust. This is a serious condemnation and yet it is true. We stand by and allow news media and mass communication to inculcate the public's minds through headlines with contemptuous disrespect for the courts and the law itself. Are we not all students of the legal and juridical personality? Do we not have special training to understand the law and its intricate machinery? Do we not daily profess greater knowledge in it than laymen? Yet laymen, ordinary men if you will, cannot

give obedience to the law if they do not feel it is revered and loved by those who claim to know its esoteric values. We must publicly renew the faith of the great and good men who met that summer in Philadelphia. We must renew our faith in the law itself and in its institutions. Our allegiance and love for it must find a new acceptance and favor in the same way you would want to proudly cherish, fondle and protect a new born son.

I serve a challenge to you as leaders of the trial bar of America: Renew publicly in your office, in casual conversations in the coffee shops, at the dinner table, on the golf course, on the public platform, and particularly through Bar Associations, your faith in the law and your greatest respect for all of the courts of this land. If you do, we will seek and win the ultimate triumph of justice itself.

OPEN HOUSING A CAMPAIGN ISSUE?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, a recent column by the veteran publisher and syndicated columnist, David Lawrence, deals with a current issue, open housing, which is but a variation on a very old theme, Federal control versus individual rights. The issue of open housing has become a volatile one and, as Mr. Lawrence observes, might well be a prime campaign issue this year.

I include the column, "Open Housing a Campaign Issue?" by David Lawrence, in the RECORD at this point:

OPEN HOUSING A CAMPAIGN ISSUE?

"Open housing" may become a big issue in the national campaign this autumn. It affects directly more voters than many other questions which will be debated, and could cause the defeat of some Republicans and Democrats who will have voted in favor of the measure.

The proposed legislation would prohibit an owner from selling or renting his property to whomever he pleases through an agent. Less than two years from now, this would apply even to single-family, owner-occupied dwellings if the property is sold through a real-estate broker.

Persons engaged in the real-estate business throughout the country are alarmed over the prospect. They fear that home owners will feel compelled to dispose of their property on their own or through friends and acquaintances. It is pointed out that owners will be deprived of professional help in the selling of a house or in the financing arrangements or in the process of mediation which develops between buyer and seller in fixing the sale price.

The reasoning behind the protest is not so much related to a desire by an owner to discriminate between buyers, but is based upon a belief that, if certain neighborhoods are open to Negro purchasers, real-estate values will quickly drop and owners may see their equity reduced substantially.

There are 85,000 real-estate brokers or agents throughout the country, and they have consistently opposed interference by the government in what they regard as a transaction in private property. It is argued, for instance, that if the government can tell a person to whom he must sell his home when he gets ready to seek a buyer through a real-estate agent, then the same rule can also be applied to any kind of personal

property, such as a boat or a motorcycle or an automobile.

The pending legislation is not likely to raise protests in connection with the sale or rental of the large apartment buildings or new developments. In the smaller units there will be problems. For the present tenants may not wish to remain where racial mixing among the teen-agers may lead to disturbances.

Many real-estate men are saying that, while the forthcoming legislation stipulates certain exemptions for owners of single homes and 4-unit apartments, the mere fact that within 20 months new tenants may move into neighborhoods which have not been integrated is likely to arouse considerable concern as to the prospective values of the real estate. It is estimated that by Jan. 1, 1970, the new proposals, if enacted, will cover 44.6 million units, or 68 per cent of the nation's housing.

The Constitution plainly says that no person shall be deprived of his property without due process of law, "nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation." Do the suggested restrictions mean that if the government supervises the sale of property, it is, in effect, "seizing" private homes? If so, it is being contended, the owners may ask for "just compensation" in the event that property values are diminished by reason of action by the government in forcing racial integration.

As the federal government steps into the housing field, this also affects the lending of money for mortgages. Federal funds will be withheld from those developments or projects wherein there has been any evidence of racial "discrimination."

What the federal government really will do will be to take the private real-estate business under its jurisdiction and start to supervise the sale and rental of homes. It is something novel for the federal government to become a party to the sale of private property. The question is raised whether someday its authority may be applied to insist that all forms of property, when offered for public sale, must not be disposed of on the basis of one's preference, even to friends or acquaintances, and only in accordance with a formula that corrects any form of "racial imbalance."

The "open housing" issue has been fought out on a state or local basis in referendums in different areas across the country during the last few years, and in many cases the people have rejected the idea at the polls. Certainly the "open housing" question will be debated in the coming presidential and congressional campaign, and many a Senator and Representative will find his vote on this issue in Congress challenged next autumn.

AL CAPONE A PATSY IN COMPARISON

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the present issue of Human Events, the alert Washington newsweekly, carried an extensive article by Phillip Abbott Luce entitled, "Is the U.S. Facing Insurrection?" Luce, a former leader of the new left, organizer of two students trips to Cuba in 1963 and 1964, and an officer of the progressive labor movement, is well qualified to comment on current happenings in radical circles.

The violence and destruction advocat-

ed by leaders of various radical groups in this country makes U.S. gangland history in this country seem like a tame game of boyhood's cops and robbers in comparison. Yet, the recently issued Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders gave but passing notice to this current threat.

I would suggest that one read this article by Mr. Luce and then consult the pertinent passages of the Riot Commission's report. One will wonder if both sources are dealing with the same subject.

I include the above-mentioned article from Human Events of March 23, 1968, in the RECORD at this point:

IS THE U.S. FACING INSURRECTION?—RADICALS AND BLACK REVOLUTIONARIES PLAN SUMMER OF VIOLENCE

(By Phillip Abbott Luce)

The summer of 1968 could well be the "longest" and "hottest" yet encountered in this country. The mass media, the police, the various investigating committees and the black revolutionaries are all predicting that it will surpass our past riot-torn summers in both violence and destruction.

Expecting these serious conflagrations, the police agencies throughout the country are training and arming on an unparalleled level. The various city governments are also preparing for the coming summer riots by attempting to rush into existence a myriad of "social welfare" programs to try to offset the intensive propaganda in the ghetto areas calling for revolution. And, on an individual basis, a growing number of white citizens are arming themselves against the day the riots spread outside the ghetto.

All of this spells trouble for the country: the worst outbreak of violence since the Civil War. It now appears that the riots that swept the country last year were only a training ground for both the police and the black revolutionaries.

Even President Johnson has admitted that we face a summer of ghetto violence. His special citizens committee, headed by Gov. Otto Kerner of Illinois and Mayor John Lindsay of New York City, while overlooking the extent of the role of black revolutionary provocateurs, has also admitted that the outlook is good for continued ghetto riots. The FBI, the National Guard, federal marshals and the United States Army are also actively training men in the event that the riots again get out of hand and federal law enforcement is needed to handle the situation.

But, while the various police agencies are planning for the worst, the black revolutionary forces are also planning and hoping to expand the riots and to make them even more violent than in the past.

As a prelude to the summer, the first offensive will come in Washington, D.C., where the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King has called for a "poor people's campaign" to begin on April 22. Although this demonstration does not openly advocate violence, the actual programs of the "campaign" could well set off considerable violence in the Nation's Capital.

According to published reports, the Washington siege of Dr. King and his Southern Christian Leadership Conference will include the picketing of government offices, a "lobby-in" in the halls of Congress and possibly the White House, "sit-ins" in federal buildings, the setting up of shanties in public places, "dislocating" the functioning of the government and blocking bridges and highways.

In a series of organizational meetings around the country, King has stated that "to dislocate the functioning of a city without destroying it can be more effective than a riot, because it can be longer lasting and more costly to society."

An informant has also told Sen. John McClellan's (D-Ark.) Permanent Investigating subcommittee: "King has turned to recruiting trained agitators from 'Black Power,' student and anti-war groups in order to fill out his ranks, save money and time. All his hard-core protestors will be professionals drawn from other militant groups."

King denies there will be any violence, but he has met secretly with black revolutionaries Stokely Carmichael and H. Rap Brown, who at this point are planning to remain discretely in the background during King's camp-in.

King's planned demonstration is aimed at forcing the government to appropriate approximately \$10 billion to guarantee an "annual income" for everyone, including those with no jobs. Obviously, King is trying to blackmail the government into some action acceptable to him and various other revolutionaries. He has now openly warned the government that "If nothing is done, I think the riots this summer will be worse than last summer. Talk of guerrilla warfare can increase and even become a reality."

This so-called "poor people's campaign" may well turn into violence, but so far it hardly compares with other activities presently occurring in the ghetto areas of the nation.

Police reports, coupled with personal visits to any number of cities across the nation, have confirmed in my mind that unprecedented violence is being planned. It is especially important that we understand what the revolutionaries and Communists are hoping for this coming summer and what plans have already been laid in order to throw this country into a state of anarchy.

Richard H. Sanger, the author of *Insurgent Era* and one of the country's top authorities on the causes and patterns of political violence, has said that "it is well within the realm of possibility" that an open insurrection against the government is developing. Interviewed in *U.S. News & World Report* (Dec. 25, 1967), Sanger said, "We are passing from mere nuisance demonstrations over civil rights and the Viet Nam war to something much more violent and dangerous. . . . Based on my own experience observing the course of a half-dozen insurgencies and revolts overseas—in Algeria, Jordan, Kenya, Cuba, Angola and the Congo—I've been disturbed to note the similarities with the situation we now have in this country."

Following the riots last summer, the pro-Chinese Communist Progressive Labor party stated that "the wheels are turning, particularly in the minds of the black community, over the facts that an uprising of this sort [in Detroit] can stop the economy of a city, authorities can be made to blunder and muddle, fear can be instilled into a surprisingly large number of troops and police with some ease and guerrillas can operate effectively and with relative security in a city environment."

A new addition to the writing staff of the pro-Communist weekly newspaper, the *National Guardian*, is Julius Lester, a spokesman for SNCC and a co-traveler with Stokely Carmichael to Cuba this past year. In a recent column, Lester stated:

"The struggle will be long and hard and many a heart that now beats will be shattered by a spherical, powder-filled piece of steel. Those who oppress do not respond to petitions, demonstrations and the demands of the oppressed. The oppressor murders at his leisure and does not cease until the oppressed, recognizing that the oppressor has no right to oppress, assert their right to live by using the only language the oppressor has ever used and the only language that he understands—the sound of gunfire, the sound of dynamite, the sound of his own death in his ear."

From visits to a number of ghetto areas throughout the country and in conversations

with both black militants and police two distinctive characteristics have become apparent: The mood of the ghetto is seething under the winter's cold and many black people seem willing to engage in almost kamikaze battles in the coming summer. Secondly, the black revolutionaries have changed their propaganda campaign from one advocating simple revolution and violence aimed at overthrowing the "white people structure" to an approach that stresses the need to arm and prepare for violence that will be initiated by the white man.

The revolutionary elements in the ghettos are now advocating violence as a response to "genocide" which they claim is about to be launched by the police. This kind of insidious propaganda is to be found everywhere and is being spread in pamphlets and speeches.

On February 18, Stokely Carmichael told a group in Oakland, Calif., that "Many of us feel that they [the whites] are getting ready to commit genocide against us." This kind of irresponsible demagoguery has led the black revolutionaries to making even more rash statements. James Forman, the international director of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, is presently asking fellow revolutionaries to fulfill the following "in the event" he is "assassinated":

"Ten war factories destroyed.
"Fifteen police stations blown up.
"Thirty power plants demolished.
"No flowers.
"One Southern governor, two mayor and 500 racist white cops dead.
"A generous, sustaining contribution to SNCC."

Forman is also quoted as demanding in the event of the "assassination" of Stokely Carmichael or H. Rap Brown that the above figures be doubled.

Julius Lester, writing in the *National Guardian*, parrots the same incredible line. In the February 24 issue of that paper he states: "The government has made extensive preparations for the coming summer. If necessary they'll hire somebody to go throw a rock through the window of a ghetto store. Any way you go, there is going to be violence this summer. . . ."

"Faced with the prospect of extermination, blacks are arming themselves, and saying thereby, if you are marked for death, just don't die without knowing that some honky is going to be buried the same day you are. And preferably, two or three."

To anyone who might resist this view of white America, Lester has this to say:

"For those who read this and can only view it as extreme paranoia, reflect on the history of this country—the rape of Africa for black slaves, the extermination of the Indian, the atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the war in Viet Nam. America's history shows that its capacity to murder is unfathomable. Hitler is held up to us as the example supreme of a madman, but only so that attention will be drawn away from our own madness and insanity. Blacks are taking up arms to respond to this madness. It is not the role of whites to argue against this."

A recent important merger involving SNCC points up this new approach to this coming summer's violence. The merger, which ties SNCC organizationally to the violence-oriented Black Panther party of California, was announced at a meeting called to celebrate the 26th birthday of Huey P. Newton, the Black Panther's "minister of defense."

Last October, Newton, who is prone to having himself photographed in an animal skin-covered throne while dressed in a black leather jacket, beret and holding a long rifle in one hand and a spear in another, was arrested and later indicted for murder, assault with a deadly weapon on a police officer and kidnapping.

This case, which is a rallying cry for the

black revolutionaries, is presently awaiting trial but the alleged facts indicate that Newton, who admits to always carrying a weapon, was stopped by Oakland police and after a serious altercation took place in which one policeman was shot to death and another wounded, Newton commandeered a passing car and forced the driver to take him to a hospital where he was treated for a stomach wound and later arrested.

It will be recalled that it was the Black Panther party that staged an armed demonstration at the state capitol in Sacramento some months ago in opposition to legislation favoring "gun controls." The announcement of the Black Panther-SNCC combination came from Eldridge Cleaver, the Black Panther "minister of information" who told the gathered participants: "You've all heard bits and pieces about the merger of the Black Panther Party for Self Defense and the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee. Well, it's a fact."

The new combine has announced its intention to run Huey Newton in the 7th Congressional District of Alameda County as a write-in candidate on the ultra-left "Peace and Freedom" party ticket.

At this same meeting, James Forman, who was named as minister of foreign affairs for the Black Panthers, again promised instant and specific retribution for "assassination" of black revolutionaries. He specifically singled out "these white piggish cops that occupy our communities" for murder.

H. Rap Brown spoke at the same meeting, in violation of judicial "travel restrictions" placed on him following his arrest in New Orleans for carrying a rifle in interstate commerce. Brown is presently in jail facing charges in New Orleans and in Maryland for his role in the Cambridge, Md., riot last summer.

Former SNCC Chairman Stokely Carmichael spoke about Huey Newton and his only criticism of Newton was that "if he was going down on the honky cops that night, he should have told me first." Carmichael said black people must "Create alternative systems of justice and become executioners if necessary when white cops murder black people."

In city after city that I have visited since September I have been struck with the same type of advocacy of violence among the black revolutionaries. A youthful black revolutionary in Detroit told me recently that he, along with various members of the ultra-leftist Revolutionary Action Movement, was storing arms in preparation for the summer. In Columbus, Ohio, a black leader told me that he had seen a variety of automatic weapons secreted throughout the ghetto area and that these arms included machine guns. The same picture was obvious in Newark, New York, Chicago and Miami.

The police in a number of cities are working feverishly to prevent this summer from turning into a blood bath of unimagined proportions. Special riot control classes have been held in most major cities and the police have been armed with a variety of new weapons to help control serious outbreaks of violence. In Atlanta, Ga., the police have even developed an evacuation plan in case the riots get out of control and sectors of the city have to be left to the rioters. Their plan also contains a counterattack strategy to regain these abandoned areas.

The Communist-controlled Revolutionary Action Movement (RAM) has been especially active in the ghettos during the past year, although it has been hard hit by active police surveillance and arrests. RAM is headed by Robert Williams, who now lives in Peking, China, rather than return to the United States and face kidnapping charges. Despite his absence, his RAM organization has been involved in any number of bizarre attempts to foment violence in the United States. This is one organization that matches its violent outcries with action.

A front-group for RAM, the Black Liberation Front, was responsible for the abortive attempt to blow up the Statue of Liberty and the Washington Monument in 1965. Three of its members later served prison sentences for their attempt. One of those convicted, Robert Collier, is now working on a Mayor Lindsay poverty project in New York City.

Last summer 17 members of RAM, including its U.S. leader Max Stanford and the assistant principal of a Long Island night-school, were arrested in a plot to assassinate the "moderate" black leaders (Roy Wilkins and Whitney Young). The hope of these RAM members was to create panic in the ghetto areas and place the blame on "white extremists."

Then, this past fall, Philadelphia RAM members came up with a program to poison the city water supply and kill off the members of the police force. On February 26 of this year two members of RAM in Philadelphia pleaded guilty to charges of plotting a riot there last summer. They planned to place potassium cyanide in the water supply and then begin a riot once deaths started occurring.

In the issue of Robert Williams' publication, *The Crusader*, most recently distributed in this country (it is printed in Communist China) he lays specific plans for the summer. He tells his readers:

"A tightly organized and highly mobile underground guerrilla force would have to be clandestinely organized. This well-disciplined force would play a more aggressive role. It would be well versed in handling explosives and deadly accurate when deployed as snipers. Its mission would be retaliation, to visit attrition upon the enemy and to pin down and bring about a dispersal of his concentrated forces.

"This guerrilla force must operate in small bands and know every inch of that part of the city where it is to operate. It must control its fire and use its ammunition sparingly. It must be highly mobile and constantly shift its position when sniping to avoid detection, death or capture. It must have a perfect understanding of its mission at all times.

"When operating in full view of great throngs of people, its members should cover or mask their faces to prevent revealing identity. It should handle its weapons with gloves, especially the captured ones, so as not to leave incriminating fingerprints on weapons that may later fall into the hands of repressive authority. These groups, while sniping and performing other missions of sabotage, should be extremely careful in avoiding death and injury to the friendly black population."

It has already been proved that much of the sniper fire directed against the police and army troops in Detroit last summer came from members of RAM. Robert Williams now envisions new work for his sniper teams. In the same issue of *The Crusader* Williams goes on to give specific instructions on how to make a new kind of bomb:

"Molotov cocktails are very effective weapons in urban guerrilla warfare. However, a jumbo size is even more effective. The jumbo size or the Black Power Bomb can be most effectively used against tanks and armored troop carriers where streets are narrow and buildings are three or four stories high.

"The jumbo size of the gasoline bomb can be made by using an empty syrup bottle of one-gallon capacity. These gallon-sized glass jugs are usually available around confectioneries, drugstores, restaurants and warehouses. Each is equipped with a screw-on cap and is fitted with a finger grip or a built-in ring by which to handle the bottle or jug with a single finger.

"This type of jug can be filled with almost three-fourths gasoline, about one-fourth extra-heavy motor oil with lubrication grease added. The screw-on cap should be tightened after which a Tampax, well-soaked in gaso-

line, should be securely taped or wired to the jug. The soaked Tampax or well-soaked rag is lit when the individual is ready to heave the Black Power Bomb.

"The glass jug or container breaks on impact, thus igniting the gasoline, oil and grease, resulting in a napalm-like effect. This is highly effective when heaved from a roof top into personnel (troop) carriers. It can also be thrown as a satchel charge against tanks and other armored vehicles."

It is highly improbable that a revolution such as that envisioned by Williams could succeed. After all, the black man in the United States only constitutes about 11 percent of the population, only a small portion of which would be willing to go along with such violence. Also, the conditions for an extended guerrilla war just do not exist in the United States.

Nevertheless, Williams ends his recent issue of *The Crusader* with this prophecy:

"Yes, a minority revolution could succeed in racist and imperialist America. Its chances of success today are better than at any previous time in history. America is an imperialist power with its tentacles spread around the world. It has arrogantly proclaimed its hypocritical self savior of the entire world. The fact of the matter is that it cannot even save itself. The American black man holds the balance of power in the world today. He holds the fate of America in his hands."

The nation has been fortunate that to date the ghetto riots have not spread into industrial and suburban sections. But plans of various black revolutionary organizations now reveal that they hope to change that pattern this summer. As an example of what they have in mind, there is evidence that during the Newark riots last year a number of cars full of black revolutionaries attempted literally to invade a nearby suburb but were turned back by the police.

A major hope of the various Communist organizations is to urge the black people of the nation to "rise up" against the white government. The Communists do not seriously believe that a black uprising could in itself overthrow the government and create a "black state." Instead, the Communists believe they can utilize the black nationalists to create riot conditions, thereby fomenting a race war and, they hope, nationwide anarchy.

It may sound extreme and unrealistic, but the Communists are convinced that a race war, pitting white against black, would naturally evolve into a situation in which the various law enforcement agencies could not contain the violence and law and order, as we know it, would evaporate. In this situation the Communists would hope to attempt a *coup d'etat* and possibly take power.

Of course, it must be stressed, this is only a theory, and to date the Communists know they are not strong enough to implement such a strategy; as one expert sizes up their immediate goal, "revolution, no—insurrection, yes."

Across the nation, in ghetto after ghetto, the cry for violence is being echoed by every black revolutionary—most of whom have organizations backing them up. The big-city ghettos are obvious areas of radical activity, but lately even the smaller ghetto areas have not escaped the revolutionary activity of the black nationalists.

A recent report from Reading, Pa., gives an example of the kind of bravado being exhibited. A black revolutionary there named Kiraka, who leads a group called the Progressive Organization of Afro-American Youth (POAAAY), has been quoted as stating: "As I see it, 'Black Power' is the last call for white America to accept the black man, his demands and his standards . . . our own culture, etc. If society fails, as they are failing now, the ultimate end will be a violent revolution."

This kind of revolutionary talk now can be

heard throughout the United States. Although the police are preparing for extensive trouble, this summer may test our national will to survive.

Rap Brown succinctly stated the political irrationality of the black revolutionaries which the country is up against when he bragged:

"I say that if America don't come 'round, America should be burned down."

ADDRESS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN AT LUNCHEON HONORING POSTMASTER EPHRAIM MARTIN

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on March 15, 1968, a luncheon was held in Boston sponsored by the Boston Mail Users Council honoring the postmaster of Boston, Hon. Ephraim Martin. The principal speaker at that luncheon was Hon. Lawrence F. O'Brien, the Postmaster General of the United States.

After congratulating Postmaster Martin on his years of dedicated public service, the Postmaster General stressed the close relationship between the Federal Government and business, stating:

Throughout the Federal Government the watchword is cooperation with the business community.

In my remarks I include this address delivered by Postmaster General O'Brien:

ADDRESS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN, AT THE LUNCHEON HONORING POSTMASTER EPHRAIM MARTIN

I must tell you that I have very mixed feelings about sharing this ceremony with you today. First, of course, I am delighted to join with you in honoring your Postmaster, Ephraim Martin, who holds this century's record for length of service as Boston's Postmaster, and who has a distinguished public service career spanning twenty-five years.

One of the most profound statements that I ever heard John F. Kennedy utter was when he was asked for his definition of happiness. He said that "happiness lies in full use of your powers along lines of excellence." Well, I can only say that your entire career, Postmaster Martin, is a brilliant example of full use of considerable powers along lines of recognized excellence. Therefore, I think you must be that all too rare human being—a truly happy man.

Certainly, as a "Yankee from Brooklyn" you showed all us Bay Staters that we have no monopoly on ability and hard work; and there is even a rumor that you have your own version of the Blarney Stone.

I know also that you destroyed my notion about people from Brooklyn. I once was told how a man could easily pick out a fellow from Brooklyn from any crowd. Simple. He's the guy who asks you a question, tells you the answer . . . and then says, "You're wrong."

Well, your legions of friends and admirers know that this description isn't typical of you at all. They recall, as far more accurate, your personal motto, a motto that I think well reflects your modesty and your understanding of how to get results. That great American philosopher Leo Durocher once said, "Good guys finish last." Of course, we

must remember he said this at a time when the Brooklyn Dodgers were finishing last. But I think Postmaster Martin's philosophy is far sounder and by far more meaningful: "There is no limit to the good a man can do if he doesn't care who gets the credit." The record shows clearly the staff and employees of the Boston Post Office share this philosophy.

Of course, Postmaster Martin, the abilities of you and your staff have already been justly and publicly acknowledged by the Direct Mail Advertising Association which honored you two years ago as Postmaster of the Year.

Through your intense efforts, there is an entirely new emphasis on cooperation between the mailing public, particularly large mailers, and the post office. Further, the Boston Mail Users Council is widely recognized as one of the most vigorous and effective in the nation.

And I want to take this opportunity to recognize the very significant contribution being made by Regional Director Don Steele and his staff to more efficient mail service. Don and many members of his staff are old friends and associates of mine. They are doing a great job and I want to publicly recognize their contributions to the postal service throughout the New England area.

Yesterday, I had the pleasure of talking to the Massachusetts Taxpayers Foundation here in Boston, and I brought to that group a message from the President, that I think is worth repeating here today. "One of the most difficult problems facing anyone in dealing with people, whether in government or in business, is the problem of people shaping today's actions on the basis of yesterday's realities," the President said. He continued:

"Far too often the truth is distorted, not by lies, not by deliberate fabrications, but by mythology. Too often men, rather than look around at the real world, cling to the clichés and stereotypes of yesterday. Each new fact that marches down the road of experience is seen, not for what it is, but for what men think it is, or should be, or might be. Too often our wishes, or worse, our fears, distort and obscure our opportunities. There is an only too human desire to wallow in the comfort of yesterday's well-broken-in ideas and beliefs. Unfortunately, such ideas and beliefs, in today's fast changing world, have no bearing on the problems of the day and the needs of the people."

I think these words of the President merit our attention. For what we often take for granted as common sense, may be based on circumstances that no longer exist, if they ever did. As an old philosopher once said, "Common sense is that which tells you the world is flat."

One area where yesterday's common sense is today's complete error involves the belief that there is some kind of pre-ordained combat between government and business.

There were times in the past, certainly, when friction and misunderstanding between government and business were the product of government involving itself in new areas of activity, taking on new responsibilities, regulating areas once free of control and supervision.

Given the changing relationships, given the new thrust of government into areas once marked "off limits," the concern of business was understandable.

But that concern now no longer has any foundation.

The thrust of government effort today is to work with business to the maximum possible amount.

We see this fact illuminated in many areas of activity.

We see it in the one billion dollar effort of the life insurance companies of America to help solve urban housing problems.

We see it in the really attractive travel package being devised by a large number of American businesses to make travel to and in the United States less expensive for foreign visitors. This will ease our balance of

payments problem and may also bring to Massachusetts the 2,880,000 Irish from Ireland who want to see how most of the world's Irish live.

And we can also see evidence of cooperation between the Federal government, local government and business all around us in the rebuilding of the great city of Boston.

Whenever I visit this city I am always struck by the progress that has taken place since my last visit. For example, I asked Don Steele this morning why he kept looking around so nervously. "It's the building boom here. If I'm not careful, someone will put up a building around me. It's happened three times in the last month." I have a feeling that he was exposing me to a bit of his brand of blarney, but I do know that a short walk from this building would bring us to five or six of the city's twelve renewal projects.

When Postmaster Martin took command of the Boston Post Office ten years ago, the picture was not so bright. Boston was thought to be a city without a future. Population was shrinking, taxes were rising, there was dilapidation everywhere, vacant lots were increasing, businesses and jobs were leaving at an ever increasing rate, the tax base was shrinking. In a relatively short time, half a billion dollars of assessments were lost through deterioration of properties and through land taken off the tax rolls. No major construction had taken place in Boston since the 1920's. Not one single unit of low-cost family housing had been added to the city's housing supply since 1954.

At the Federal level there had been no major housing legislation since the Housing Act of 1949 and certainly scant attention paid to the problems of the cities.

The nation is still suffering because of that inaction. Both President Kennedy and President Johnson have recognized these problems and given their solution high priority.

In late 1960, Boston began a massive Urban Renewal Program. Its objective was the physical up-grading of housing, community, commercial and industrial facilities in Boston. A short time later, in response to President Kennedy's request, the Federal Government began its own assault on the problems when Congress passed the far reaching Omnibus Housing Bill. Boston was one of the first cities to take advantage of this and other expanded Federal programs. Early in 1961, a group of concerned Bostonians had met for the purpose of charting a social up-grading program to complement the physical renewal being planned. Out of this, grew Action for Boston Community Development. With passage of the Federal Anti-Poverty Legislation in 1964, ABCD became the agency charged with administering Boston's anti-poverty program.

Also, in 1964, the Congress, at President Johnson's request, created the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Other landmark pieces of legislation, involving close cooperation with business—Model Cities, the Manpower Training and Development Act—have been passed since then. There was and is a clear commitment at the Federal level to meet the challenge and develop the means to solve urban problems.

Let's take a look at just one of these programs as an example of how Boston is going as a result of Federal initiative, vigorous local leadership under your progressive Mayor Kevin White and with business cooperation. Boston's total renewal program involves one-third of the City and over one-half of the City's residents. In addition to the renewal program there is Boston's Model City Program which in itself involves another 10% of Boston's population. The total public and private investment in all these areas approximates more than two billion dollars.

Contrast this surge of effort with the fact that in 1959 not a single major commercial building was under construction.

This record of a great city rebuilding itself into a greater city is one you can justly feel proud of.

And today I want to report to you on a further step by the Federal government to facilitate private building. Responding to a request from Mayor Kevin White to do what we could to facilitate the acquisition of the best possible site for Boston's largest office building, the new \$75 million, sixty story John Hancock building, I have today asked our Regional Director to move ahead quickly with disposition of the Back Bay Postal Annex. This decision will make the optimum site available and permit construction plans to proceed rapidly.

Today, my friends, throughout the Federal government, the watchword is cooperation with the business community.

That cooperation by no means excludes local government. In fact, enlightened local government, the kind you have here in Boston, is the key to progress. I know that is one of the principal reasons why our Governor, acting as chairman of the Governor's Conference, told President Johnson in Washington that he had worked with three Presidents and "... no one has worked more than you have to promote Federal-State relations."

I also know that the Postal Service and other Federal agencies will continue to work closely with Mayor White.

As the result of this new atmosphere of cooperation, as the result of the continuing efforts at promoting an understanding of the mutuality of interest of post office and large volume mailers, we see a clear demonstration of what effort, energy, imagination and commitment to the public good can mean for all of us.

Postmaster Martin, your contributions have been truly outstanding. And the tradition of cooperation that you have done so much to raise as a standard of excellence will continue to guide us in the days and years to come.

DISABLED VETERANS SUPPORT PRESIDENT IN VIETNAM

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, all Americans are concerned about the war in Vietnam, but I believe most Americans are convinced that we are pursuing the right course there, and that we will be successful if we continue vigorously to pursue that course. The President's statement last Saturday, reaffirming our determination to win victory against Communist aggression in Vietnam, was a declaration which I believe most Americans strongly support.

Last month in Washington, the National Executive Committee of the Disabled American Veterans adopted a resolution, entitled "Support of the President's Policy on Vietnam." By the very nature of their organization, the Disabled American Veterans are the group which must have the deepest personal knowledge of the price of war.

The DAV has decided by resolution that our determination and ultimate victory are worth the price. I would certainly like to have this resolution appear in the Record so that all of us can take part from the attitude of these men who have suffered permanent injury in previous wars.

SUPPORT OF PRESIDENT'S POLICY ON VIETNAM

Whereas, the United States has committed itself to a course of action in Vietnam, and Whereas, the purpose of America's commitment is to fight a successful war to halt Communist aggression in South Vietnam, and

Whereas, the Government of South Vietnam and the Governments of Southeast Asia look to the United States for help in protecting their freedom and their right to be left in peace, and

Whereas, the present Administration needs and must have the unqualified and unified support of all citizens loyal to our country in these perilous times, and

Whereas, should Communism win in South Vietnam, other Nations in that area will become principal targets until all Southeast Asia is under Communist domination, and

Whereas, the President has made every effort within reason to obtain a peaceful settlement; and the Communist North Vietnamese has shown no willingness to respond, and

Whereas, only the President can really make foreign policy and command our Nation's war effort,

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the DAV hereby reaffirms its approval and support of the decisions made by the President, as Commander in Chief, in his fixed purpose to stem the Communist determination to control South Vietnam and all of Southeast Asia.

HOMETOWN NEWSPAPERS SALUTED BY OUR G'S

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, a number of newspapers in the Second District of Oklahoma have a policy of sending copies of the hometown paper to men stationed in Vietnam. I believe these publishers are to be commended for their generous and personal support of our fighting men, and I know from my own visits in Vietnam how important news from home can be.

A good example of the appreciation for this link with home and of the fine spirit of our forces is shown by these two letters which appeared in the Pictorial Press of Tahlequah, Okla., on March 7, 1968:

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

DEAR EDITOR: Just a few lines to express my gratitude for the copies of The Pictorial Press you have sent me.

I will soon be returning home (Peggs). Thanks to community leaders such as you who have taken time and effort to remember us when we are away from home to make this long, long year seem a little shorter.

Thanks again, and congratulations for the fine work your newspaper is doing for the community.

Sincerely,

Msgr. G. D. TOMBLIN.

VIETNAM.

DEAR EDITOR: For the past 16 months I have received your newspaper. It has informed me of what is going on at home and really brought home closer to me. I'd like to Thank you for remembering all of us while we're over here.

This isn't what we want to do, but if

we don't stop Communism in Viet Nam, we may be fighting them in Los Angeles, New York or Tahlequah some day. If more people at home supported us in our fight, the war would be over soon. Though only 18 when I first arrived in Viet Nam, I've learned quite a bit about the people. They want their freedom as much as we did in 1776.

It's for people like you that we fight this war. Instead of provoking our cause and printing anti-war slogans, you try your best to bring home town news to the Tahlequah boys fighting in Viet Nam. As a Tahlequah boy and a member of the Special Forces in Viet Nam, I'd like to say "Thanks" for myself and my unit for remembering us. I'm sure all the other Tahlequah boys in Viet Nam feel the way I do.

Sincerely,

TOM ROACH,
5th Special Forces.

VIETNAM.

INDUSTRIAL BOND RULING HARMFUL TO OKLAHOMA

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, last week the Department of the Treasury decided suddenly to eliminate the tax-exempt status of certain industrial development bonds issued by States, counties, and towns to help create jobs for their citizens. These bonds have been used with great success in Oklahoma, and a number of us from Oklahoma were quite disturbed by the ruling.

I have received a resolution from the Oklahoma Industrial Development and Park Commission over the signature of its very able chairman. Lt. Gov. George Nigh, which very strongly presents the feeling that all of us from Oklahoma have about this ruling. I would like to have this ruling appear in the RECORD.

It is my deep desire that Congress can pass legislation which would permit the continued issuance of these bonds, which have opened the door to employment and prosperity to many of the communities in my district, while at the same time curbing certain abuses of these bonds.

RESOLUTION BY OKLAHOMA INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AND PARK COMMISSION

Whereas the U.S. Treasury Department has by recently announced ruling arbitrarily overturned the long standing exemption of interest paid on bonds issued by States and their sub-divisions of government for industrial development purposes, effective as March 15, 1968; and

Whereas Oklahoma is one of the many states which in recent years has enjoyed a respectable industrial growth due very largely to investment funds made possible by such exemption of interest on industrial bonds from Federal income taxes, whose industrial progress is now seriously threatened by such arbitrary action on the part of the Treasury Department; and

Whereas said action is in direct conflict with the expressed policy of the present administration in Washington, to increase jobs and payrolls and reduce the number "hard-core" employable, the accomplishment of which desirable objectives depends in substantial degree upon availability of invest-

ment funds with which to finance new and expanding industries; and

Whereas the aforesaid Treasury Department action will also result in reduced, rather than greater, Federal tax revenues, in that the aggregate of Federal tax revenues to be received, directly or indirectly, from increased payrolls in related economic activity made possible by the prescribed type of industrial bond financing will exceed by the increase in revenue accruing from the tax ability of such interest; and

Whereas, a further effect of such action to be foreseen as private capital is thus forced out of industrial bonds investment, is a much greater dependence upon Federal funds with which to finance industrial projects, with decisions affecting the progress of our cities and towns being made in Washington instead of being made locally; and

Whereas such action by the U.S. Treasury Department in overturning long-standing administrative interpretation of the law, represents an invasion of the power of Congress solely to make such a vital and important decision, and should not be allowed to stand unchallenged, now therefore be it

1. Resolved, That the aforesaid action by the U.S. Treasury Department should be, and it is hereby, deplored and condemned and should be reversed by action of Congress.

2. Resolved, That the effect of such action on the State of Oklahoma, and particularly upon the smaller cities and towns in this State, will be most harmful and injurious, rendering much more difficult our problem of cooperating with the Federal Government in decreasing job opportunities for the unemployed and under employed in this area.

3. That copies of this Resolution be distributed to all Members of Congress of Oklahoma, including the U.S. Senators from Oklahoma, to the President of the United States, his Secretary of the Treasury, and the Officers of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives.

Dated this 13th day of March, 1968, at Oklahoma City, Okla.

GEORGE NIGH,
Chairman.

Attest:

CLARENCE WRIGHT,
Secretary.

IRISH IMMIGRATION RESTRICTIONS

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, Sunday was St. Patrick's Day, an occasion for reflection about the contributions of Americans of Irish descent who helped to build this land. It is appropriate on this occasion to turn our attention to an incidental effect of the 1965 immigration reform legislation, which is closing the doors to many sons of Ireland desiring to immigrate to the United States.

The 1965 Immigration and Nationality Act reformed America's immigration policy by ending the arbitrary and unjust national origins quota system and substituting a system of preferences giving priority to the reuniting of families and the admission of immigrants with needed skills.

In the case of Ireland, where most immigrants have been young, without formal training or immediate family al-

ready in the United States, the new preference categories have frozen out many potential Irish immigrants.

One of the most severe obstacles is section 212 (a) (14) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1955 which requires aliens in certain categories to obtain a labor certificate. Before the act was amended, aliens who wished to enter the United States could do so, unless the Secretary of Labor certified that—

(A) There are available in the United States at the alien's proposed destination sufficient workers able, willing, and qualified at the time of application for a visa and for admission to the United States, to perform such skilled or unskilled labor, or (B) the employment of such aliens will adversely affect the wages and working conditions of workers in the United States similarly employed.

Under the 1965 changes the burden of proof has been reversed. Instead of providing that an alien can enter unless the Secretary says no, it now says that an alien cannot enter unless the Secretary says yes. Far from being merely a technical change, this provision requires a prospective immigrant to prove that he will not be displacing an American worker. In practice, this is almost impossible.

In addition, section 204(a) requires sixth-preference immigrants—skilled and unskilled workers—to have a definite job before they immigrate. A worker cannot request his own visa; his employer must do it for him. This is an additional obstacle.

Two bills of mine would alleviate the effects of the 1965 act by removing the definite job requirements—H.R. 15350—and by amending section 212(a) (14) to conform to its language prior to the 1965 act—H.R. 7775. My bills would simply mitigate the unanticipated effects of the new law.

Since the passage of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1955, Irish immigration has fallen off sharply. For example, the number of inquiries to the American Embassy, Dublin, regarding immigration to the United States has decreased steadily:

Inquiries:	
1964	6,483
1965	5,797
1966	4,725
1967	4,100

¹ Estimate; exact figure not available.

Similarly, applicants for immigrant visas have decreased:

Applicants:	
1964	5,817
1965	4,750
1966	1,996
1967	2,026

And the number of visas actually issued has also declined:

Visas issued:	
1964	4,619
1965	4,004
1966	1,741
1967	1,809

Immigration from Ireland is now running at a rate less than half of what it was in 1964.

A study prepared at my request by the American Embassy in Dublin last April 1967, stated:

There is no doubt that Section 212 (a) (14) of the Act has caused a decrease in Irish immigration to the United States. As many Irish visa applicants are unskilled or semi-skilled workers, they are unable to qualify under Section 212 (a) (14) as amended.

I entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 113, part 10, page 13167, a study on Irish immigration to the United States. These statistics were brought up to date in a supplementary letter which I entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 113, part 20, page 27250.

I have received a report from the American Embassy at Dublin bringing the statistics up to the end of 1967. It illustrates a further decrease in Irish immigration to the United States.

I include Ambassador Raymond R. Guest's letter of February 8, 1968, at this point in the RECORD.

DUBLIN, IRELAND,
February 8, 1968.

Hon. WILLIAM F. RYAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RYAN: I refer to your letter of January 23, 1968, and to our interim reply of January 31, 1968, in regard to bringing up-to-date the statistics concerning Irish immigration furnished you in September 1967.

The statistics which you requested are as follows:

1. Question: All persons who have made an inquiry regarding immigration from Ireland to the United States.

Answer:

July 1967	329
August 1967	373
September 1967	328
October 1967	347
November 1967	288
December 1967	184

Total 1,849

2. Question: All persons for whom a petition or labor certification has been approved, or who have established their exemption from the provisions of Section 212(a) (14) of Immigration Act of 1955, i.e. applicants for immigrant visas.

Answer:

July 1967	211
August 1967	220
September 1967	171
October 1967	213
November 1967	181
December 1967	200

Total 1,196

3. Question: The number of immigrant visas issued, and refused to Irish applicants by each preference category, as well as immediate relatives and special immigrants.

Answer: See Table 1 (enclosed).

4. Question: The occupations of applicants to whom immigrant visas were issued under the third, the sixth and the nonpreference categories; by category.

Answer: See Table 2 (enclosed)

5. Question: The number of preliminary visa questionnaires which gave occupations listed in Schedule B of Title 29, Part 60, Section 60.2(a) (2), Subtitle A of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR).

Answer:

July	1
August	—
September	—
October	1
November	2
December	1

Total 5

It is a pleasure to be of assistance to you in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

RAYMOND R. GUEST,
American Ambassador.

TABLE 1.—IMMIGRANT VISAS ISSUED AND REFUSED AT DUBLIN TO IRISH APPLICANTS

Classification	July 1-Dec. 31, 1967	
	Issued	Refused
Preference and nonpreference		
1st	2	—
2d	18	1
3d	—	—
4th	—	—
5th	128	29
6th	—	—
Nonpreference	594	57
Total	742	87
Immediate relatives:		
IR-1	17	3
IR-2	13	1
IR-3	—	—
IR-4	9	—
IR-5	13	—
Total	52	4
Special immigrants:		
SA-1	—	—
SA-2	—	—
SA-3	—	—
SB-1	35	2
SD-1	14	—
SD-2	—	—
Total	49	2

Note: The majority of applicants, who are shown as having been refused visas, ultimately overcame the grounds of their ineligibility and were issued visas. For instance, an applicant who lacks a police certificate or sufficient evidence of support would be refused a visa. Upon receipt of the required documents, if satisfactory, the applicant would be eligible to receive a visa.

TABLE 2.—OCCUPATIONS OF APPLICANTS ISSUED IMMIGRANT VISAS FROM JULY 1 TO DEC. 31, 1967, TO WHOM SEC. 212(a)(14) IS APPLICABLE

Occupation	3d pref- erence	6th pref- erence	Non- preference
Domestic	—	—	181
Nurse	—	—	67
Nun	—	—	66
Priest	—	—	43
Teacher	—	—	16
Nurses aide	—	—	1
Children's nurse	—	—	1
Tutor-governess	—	—	1
Religious student	—	—	1
Mechanical engineer	—	—	8
Civil engineer	—	—	4
Electronic engineer	—	—	2
Electrical engineer	—	—	3
Chemical engineer	—	—	1
Aeronautical engineer	—	—	1
Engineer	—	—	1
Biochemist	—	—	3
Physiotherapist	—	—	3
Radiographer	—	—	1
Medical doctor	—	—	3
Research scientist	—	—	2
Research chemist	—	—	2
Research veterinarian	—	—	1
Chemist	—	—	2
University lecturer	—	—	2
University professor	—	—	1
Barrister at law	—	—	1
Chartered accountant	—	—	1
Sociologist	—	—	1
Architect	—	—	1
Draftsman	—	—	2
Accounting clerk	—	—	1
Communications assistant	—	—	1
Secretary	—	—	11
Shorthand typist	—	—	5
Typist	—	—	3
Clerk	—	—	1
Keypunch operator	—	—	1
Maintenance foreman	—	—	1
Factory manager	—	—	1
Hotel manager, steward	—	—	1
Assistant creamery manager	—	—	1
Cabinetmaker	—	—	3
Motor mechanic	—	—	1
Driver	—	—	2
Electrician	—	—	1
Glazier	—	—	1
Handyman	—	—	1
Dipper	—	—	1
Panel beater	—	—	1
Knitting machine operator	—	—	1
Knitter	—	—	3

TABLE 2.—OCCUPATIONS OF APPLICANTS ISSUED IMMIGRANT VISAS FROM JULY 1 TO DEC. 31, 1967, TO WHOM SEC. 212(a)(14) IS APPLICABLE—Continued

Occupation	3d pref- erence	6th pref- erence	Non- preference
Sewing machinist.....			1
Hairdresser.....			1
Airline stewardess.....			4
Airline instructor.....			1
Airline pilot.....			1
Airline official.....			1
Riding instructor.....			1
Waiter.....			2
Chef.....			2
Butler.....			1
Housekeeper (hotel).....			1
Professional football coach.....			1
Total.....			482

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 7775 and 15350 remedy unforeseen defects in the Immigration Nationality Act of 1965 which discriminate particularly against immigrants from Ireland. In this Chamber, it is hardly necessary to dwell on the accomplishments of Americans of Irish descent. I hope we will act on our words of friendship for Ireland and remove the obstacles to those sons of Ireland who wish to immigrate to the United States.

For the further confirmation of my colleagues I include an article on this matter from today's New York Times written by John Corry:

IMMIGRATION SHOWS AN ETHNIC CHANGE
(By John Corry)

The pattern of immigration to the United States is changing, and it is about to change more as increasing numbers of Italians, Greeks, Chinese, Portuguese and Filipinos replace declining number of English, Irish, Dutch and Germans.

The extent of the change has surprised even those who fought hardest for it. Moreover, it will become more pronounced after July 1 when the last traces of the national origins quota system disappear.

This, in turn, has touched off some feeling in Congress that the Immigration laws ought to be amended further. Some ethnic groups in the United States, most notably the American Irish Immigration Committee, are lobbying to see that this is done.

On Saturday, the committee took its case to the people, distributing buttons at the St. Patrick's parade here that said, "Immigration or Die 1968." The words surrounded a big green shamrock.

The national origins quota system, which had determined the pattern of immigration since 1929, sought to preserve the ethnic balance that existed in the United States when the 1920 census was taken.

As a practical matter, this meant that emigrants from Britain and Northern Ireland, Germany and Ireland could make up 70 per cent of the emigrants from the Eastern Hemisphere who were to be admitted to the United States each year.

Asians were virtually excluded from entry, while emigration from Latin America and Canada was allowed to continue without any numerical restriction.

The national origins quota system was revised in October, 1965. The revision provided that, until July 1, 1968, no foreign country would have its quota of potential immigrants to the United States reduced, but that the unused portion of each quota would be assigned to a pool from which potential immigrants from all nations could be drawn.

Britain, for example, annually had between 40,000 and 50,000 unused places in its quota. However, in Italy, which had an annual quota of 5,666 before the law was revised, more than 200,000 people were seeking admission to the United States.

Under the revised law, Britain's unused places, along with those of other countries, were distributed among the emigrants from Italy and of other countries, including the Asian ones, where the demand for United States visas had always surpassed the supply.

The distribution was done under a preference system that gave most of the new visas to relatives of United States residents. A lesser number was distributed on the basis of talents and skills that were needed in the United States.

After July 1, when the national origins quota system passes away, this preference system will govern immigration to the United States almost entirely.

Already, however, the effect of the new system has been dramatic.

The 1965 fiscal year—from July 1, 1964, to June 30, 1965—was the last full year under the old rules for immigration. The 1967 fiscal year was the first full year under the revised system.

COMPARISON MADE

Following is a comparison of the 10 leading suppliers of immigrants and the number from each who entered the United States with immigrant visas in both years:

1965	
Britain and No. Ireland.....	29,056
Germany.....	22,899
Poland.....	6,488
Italy.....	5,666
Ireland.....	5,506
Netherlands.....	2,940
France.....	2,901
Soviet Union.....	2,697
Sweden.....	2,496
Norway.....	2,363

1967	
Britain and No. Ireland.....	23,071
Italy.....	20,000
China.....	16,505
Portugal.....	12,137
Greece.....	11,170
Germany.....	8,333
Philippines.....	7,128
Poland.....	4,451
Yugoslavia.....	4,218
India.....	4,143

Furthermore, the Visa Office in the State Department says, the new immigration will shift further in the first full year after the national quotas are abolished.

It estimates that the 10 leading countries will look this way in 1969:

Italy.....	20,000
Greece.....	20,000
Portugal.....	20,000
China.....	20,000
Philippines.....	13,000
India.....	6,000
Poland.....	5,000
Yugoslavia.....	5,000
Germany.....	3,000
Korea.....	2,900

After July 1, a limit of 120,000 is to be placed on emigrants from the Western Hemisphere, although there will be no limit on the number from any one country. Moreover, the preference system will not apply to Western Hemisphere emigrants.

For Eastern Hemisphere emigrants, however, the preference will be offered on a first-come, first-served basis. That is, if a Taiwanese who has a brother or sister in San Francisco applies for a visa on July 2 he will get it before, say, a Londoner with a brother or sister in New York who applies on July 3.

NO SERIOUS OBJECTIONS

No one in Congress appears to be quarreling seriously with this procedure or with the abolition of the national origins quota systems.

For one thing, a Senate source said, "Congressmen don't want to look like racists." (For another, a Republican Representative

said, the immigration law is too complicated to be easily grasped.)

No one, either, appears to be seriously questioning whether the United States can assimilate a different generation of immigrants. Indeed, the number of immigrants now is relatively small compared with the great days of immigration before World War I.

In the 1967 fiscal year, the total of immigrants from all sources was 361,972, the highest in 43 years, but six times between 1905 and 1914 the number surpassed one million. The smallest number of immigrants in that period was 751,786.

Immigrants represented a much larger percentage of the population. The population in 1910 according to the Bureau of the Census was 91,972,268; today, it is more than 200 million.

Nonetheless, there is agitation that the traditional sources of immigrants, countries with old cultural, political and economic bonds with the United States, are being discriminated against.

For example, the preference system aims at reuniting families that were divided when an earlier generation of emigrants left their homes. However, the traditional emigrant from Northern Europe is not a family man; he crosses the Atlantic alone and founds a family here.

The Southern European pattern is different. Italians, Greeks and Portuguese cross with wives and children and send home for parents, brothers and sisters. The preference system favors them.

Moreover, the preference system into which a traditional Northern European might fit—that of immigrants who will perform skilled or unskilled labor—is one of the smallest, with room for no more than 17,000 persons. It also is tightly circumscribed by Federal regulations aimed at protecting the native American labor force.

POLICY IS PROTECTED

Consequently, a young Irishman, say, who might have immigrated to the United States to find work as a bartender, laborer or cook's helper, is now barred from entry because there is a surfeit here of bartenders, laborers and cooks' helpers.

This has led groups such as the American Irish Immigration Society to protest.

"The Irish can never stand satisfied until the disgraceful blot of the present United States immigration policy is erased," says John P. Collins, the president of the society.

U.S. VETERANS ADVISORY COMMISSION

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Veterans Advisory Commission has submitted its report to the Administrator of Veterans Affairs. I want to congratulate and thank the members of the Commission for a report which will no doubt become the basis for future legislation concerning veterans' benefits.

From the report of the citizens of this country can easily assess the hard work and long hours of study that went into the compiling of such a document. The veterans of this country will appreciate this comprehensive review of every present program and the evaluation of proposals for needed improvements and new

legislation recommended by the many who testified in the hearings.

This report is a compliment to those who have served this Nation in the Armed Forces. Instigated at the request of the President, the Commission has produced a document that will no doubt become the cornerstone of all future legislation enacted, or revisions to present legislation. On the basis of the report, the administration and Congress will have a firsthand review available detailing the actual problems and needs of our veterans. At the same time the proposals assure that—as the President asked—the American taxpayer is getting his money's worth in the veterans' benefit programs.

I compliment the members of the Commission for a job well done. I believe that this study and its recommendations are by far the most equitable ever presented. When we discuss veterans' benefits all programs must look to the future. This report looks far into the future and makes proposals that can be adjusted to the changes in our social and economic structures.

I appreciate the fact that this report does not mince words or become ambiguous. It deals straightforwardly with the problems, and makes suggestions. I am sure that, using the report as a basis, we will be able to fulfill our obligation to our veterans and their dependents.

I thank the Commission for their devotion to the task they were asked to perform. I believe they deserve the highest praise for their great accomplishment.

IMPACT AID

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I hope the House conferees appointed yesterday will endorse the wise decision of the other body to add \$90,965,000 for the impacted school aid program to H.R. 15399, the urgent supplemental appropriations bill.

The Senate amendment would permit the Office of Education to fully fund the impact aid entitlements of some 4,200 school districts. Without this extra money, payments will fall about 20 percent short. In fairness to these school systems, many of which have based long-range plans on the assumption that full entitlements would be forthcoming, we really have no choice other than to accept the amendment.

Many of us have been hearing about the impending shortage from the school administrators back home.

As a Congressman for the most heavily impacted school system in the Nation—the San Diego Unified School District—I am acutely aware of the urgency behind the appeals from these school superintendents.

San Diego City Schools expected to receive about \$6 million under Public Law 874 this year. Without the additional appropriations voted by the other body, the system will lose \$1.2 million of its allocation.

Where will the cuts be made, if we fail to provide this money?

In San Diego, I am advised, there would have to be some reduction of maintenance and other support services. Eventually the local taxpayers, already burdened with one of the country's higher property rates, would have to make up the deficit by remitting another 12 cents for every \$100 of assessed valuation. San Diegans today are paying \$4.04 per \$100 for their schools.

Some 27,000 students now enrolled in San Diego's schools have parents who live or work on tax-exempt Federal installations. San Diegans have demonstrated a willingness to do their share to support our national defense effort and many other Federal activities.

Congress should respond by providing more equitable compensation for the school systems in all the areas that are assisting the National Government, at a great expense in lost tax revenues, in this time of crisis.

FULL SUFFRAGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, our hopes that last year's reorganization of the District of Columbia Government would bring the citizens of the District closer to their governing body have materialized.

However, it is only a limited move; for the denial of full sovereignty for District citizens remains a blot on the most basic principles of a free democracy that we in the United States are ready to proudly proclaim. Fortunately, we do see some sign of hope in the fact that the Rules Committee presently has before it a proposed constitutional amendment which would give the citizens of the District voting representation in Congress.

As one measure of the broad support for this legislation, the AFL-CIO, at its recent convention, renewed the call for full suffrage in the District of Columbia, and made a solid pledge to help in every way possible to achieve it at the earliest possible date. With unanimous consent, I now offer the federation's resolution, to be reprinted, as follows, at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

RESOLUTION NO. 115—FULL SUFFRAGE FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Whereas, Citizens and Union members of Washington, D.C. have for many decades advocated full suffrage for the District of Columbia, and

Whereas, The Congress of the United States has passed a constitutional amendment which has been ratified by the states granting the right to vote for President and Vice President to the citizens of the District of Columbia, and

Whereas, The Prospects for home rule and national representation are brighter now than for many years; therefore, be it

Resolved: That all segments of the AFL-CIO be urged to assist the Greater Washington Central Labor Council, AFL-CIO in

securing the passage of legislation to achieve these objectives.

RESOLUTION TO SIGNIFY CONGRESSIONAL AWARENESS OF THE URBAN CRISIS

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce, for appropriate reference, a House resolution to change the name of the Committee on Banking and Currency from its present designation to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. In proposing a change in name I in no way propose that the current jurisdiction of the committee be expanded or shifted, nor that the present involvement in the field of urban affairs by any other House committee be contracted or withdrawn.

My proposal is based in large measure upon the recommendation of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress. But, recent events also underscore the fact that the press and public are not aware of the scope of the activities of the Committee on Banking and Currency, nor that our involvement in the problems of the urban crisis is based upon a great understanding and expertise in this area. A change in name would be fitting not only in terms of the nature of our concerns, but also in terms of letting the public know that the Congress has a standing committee which has as one of its principal duties a continuing interest in the existing and emerging problems of our cities and metropolitan areas.

The report of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress was cognizant of this fact. The reasoning for the recommendation was:

The phenomenal growth of urban areas, the enormous problems of this growth has spawned, and the current and probable future expansion of Federal programs to deal with these problems, signified in part by the creation of a new Department of Housing and Urban Development, point to the need for specialized congressional recognition of this increasingly significant area of public policy. The present concern of the Banking and Currency Committees in each House with housing problems, coupled with the membership and staff expertise in this general area, make these committees the logical instruments for the evaluation of proposals dealing with new matters affecting urban areas. The Joint Committee does not feel, particularly in view of the relatively light workload of these committees as they now exist as well as their expertise in the area of housing, that a separate urban affairs committee in each House is justified.

The statement of the joint committee certainly summarizes my own thoughts. Their view is based upon 17 months of intensive study into the organization and operation of the Congress. I should elaborate, however, for my concurrence with their proposal is based upon 18 years of service with the Banking and Currency Committee, the last 6 as ranking minority member of both the full committee and the Special Subcommittee on Housing, a period in which the committee has

grown in stature, specialization, and understanding in the complex field of housing and urban development.

The Banking and Currency Committee was established in 1865. Its initial mandate gave it jurisdiction over all propositions relating to banking and currency. However, its activities were somewhat limited during the first 50 years of its existence because the work of overseeing the monetary policies of the Nation was exercised by the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures. During the Wilson administration the committee began to play a far more active role in the legislative review of banking practices in the Nation, its active role in the field of banking culminating with the absorption of that jurisdiction of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures dealing with all monetary matters following the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

The committee's involvement in the field of housing began in 1937. The referral of the public housing legislation to the Banking and Currency Committee was based upon the natural link of money and credit with the building and purchasing of homes. The same essential interlocking between urban development and the mortgage financing market has, since the start of this decade, led the committee into the broader area where our concern is not limited to units of housing alone, but with the quality of the human environment. In fact, our committee is the parent committee of the Department of Housing and Urban Development with legislative review of nearly every program administered by HUD.

The Senate Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization took note of this development to some extent in its report entitled "Federal Role in Urban Affairs." The Senate report stated that since 1961 both the Congress and the executive branch have responded to the urgent needs of the Nation by "devising new and sweeping programs which, for the first time, place the Federal Government in a position to mount an attack on our urban problems on a broad enough front to be commensurate with the ramifications of the entrenched problems themselves."

In the vanguard of this movement has been the House Committee on Banking and Currency.

It is to the Banking and Currency Committee that the House has looked for creative legislation in college, elderly housing, low-rent public housing, urban renewal, community development, urban mass transportation, urban planning, open spaces, and water and sewer programs as well as the mortgage and credit devices necessary to spur the development of both nonprofit and commercial housing. Our efforts have grown from providing public housing for the indigent to a full-scale attack on urban blight through the Demonstration Cities Act which couples programs to overcome educational disadvantages, disease, and enforced idleness with efforts to improve substantially the housing, highways, and sanitation systems that exist in the inner city.

Mr. Speaker, 13 proposals in the 89th Congress and an additional 28 in this Congress to establish a separate committee on urban affairs indicates that not even Members of the House are aware of either the extent of the involvement of the Committee on Banking and Currency in this area or the depth of its expertise. This proposal to change the name of the committee to more properly identify its function would go a long way toward rectifying this problem. More importantly, to my mind, is the fact that we, the Congress, would be publicly informing the Nation of our far-reaching concern for the problems of the cities and our continuing determination to remedy them with constructive legislation.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. VANIK, for 15 minutes, tomorrow, March 20; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LUKENS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HALPERN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. QUIE, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. HOSMER, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. ZWACH, for 30 minutes, on March 20.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. DORN in two instances.

Mr. RUMSFELD.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LUKENS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KLEPPE.

Mr. CURTIS.

Mr. BATTIN.

Mr. ASHBROOK.

Mr. SCHERLE.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM in three instances.

Mr. MCCLORY.

Mr. COLLIER in four instances.

Mr. HALPERN in two instances.

Mr. BUTTON.

Mr. SCHADEBERG.

Mr. KUPFERMAN in five instances.

Mr. DENNEY.

Mrs. BOLTON.

Mr. TAFT in four instances.

Mr. MACGREGOR.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. REUSS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. POOL.

Mr. BURTON of California.

Mr. LONG of Maryland.

Mr. BINGHAM.

Mr. KARTH.

Mr. MATSUNAGA in two instances.

Mr. MONTGOMERY in two instances.

Mr. WOLFF in four instances.

Mr. PODELL in two instances.

Mr. HENDERSON.

Mr. GIAIMO.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

Mr. BOLLING in two instances.

Mr. COHELAN in two instances.

Mr. HELSTOSKI.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas.

Mr. BROWN of California.

Mrs. KELLY.

Mr. ROONEY of New York.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. ROSENTHAL.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in three instances.

Mr. DONOHUE in three instances.

Mr. LENNON.

Mr. NICHOLS.

Mr. BARING.

Mr. HEBERT.

Mr. EILBERG.

Mr. RESNICK.

Mr. FRASER.

Mr. CASEY in two instances.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts in two instances.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN.

Mr. WHITENER in three instances.

Mr. OLSEN in two instances.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 793. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the Alabama Space Science Exhibit Commission;

S. 876. An act relating to Federal support of education of Indian students in sectarian institutions of higher education; and

S. 2336. An act to determine the respective rights and interests of the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation and the Yakima Tribes of Indians of the Yakima Reservation and their constituted tribal groups in and to a judgment fund on deposit in the Treasury of the United States, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did, on March 18, 1968, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 14743. An act to eliminate the reserve requirements for Federal Reserve notes and for U.S. notes and Treasury notes of 1890.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 20, 1968, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1660. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on the agricultural conservation program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, pursuant

to the provisions of 50 Stat. 329; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1661. A letter from the Commissioner, government of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "District of Columbia Gun Control Act of 1968"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1662. A letter from the Commissioner, government of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish a revolving fund for the development of housing for low and moderate income persons and families in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1663. A letter from the Commissioner, government of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend an act providing for the zoning of the District of Columbia and the regulation of the location, height, bulk, and uses of buildings and other structures and of the uses of land in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1938, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1664. A letter from the Commissioner, government of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the employment of minors in the District of Columbia," approved May 29, 1928; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1665. A letter from the Commissioner, government of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the hours of employment and safeguard the health of female employees in the District of Columbia," approved February 24, 1914; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1666. A letter from the Commissioner, government of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to prohibit landlords from retaliating against tenants for good faith complaints of housing violations in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1667. A letter from the Commissioner, government of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to utilize volunteers for active police duty; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1668. A letter from the Commissioner, government of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the disposition of unclaimed property in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1669. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of need to increase effectiveness of the Neighborhood Youth Corps program for aiding students and unemployed youths in Cleveland, Ohio, Department of Labor; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1670. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of omission of facilities for metering electricity in individual housing units proposed to reduce construction costs of low-rent public housing projects, Department of Housing and Urban Development; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1671. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 18, United States Code, relating to conflicts of interest, with respect to the members of the District of Columbia Council; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1672. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the transfer, conveyance, lease, and improvement of, and construction on, certain property in the District of Columbia, for use as a headquarters site for the Organization of American States, as sites for gov-

ernments of foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1180. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee on Science and Astronautics. H.R. 15856. A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1181). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1103. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 4282, a bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to eliminate certain requirements with respect to effectuating marketing orders for cherries (Rept. No. 1182). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1104. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 10477, a bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to increase the amount of home loan guarantee entitlement from \$7,500 to \$10,000, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1183). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1105. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 10790, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the protection of the public health from radiation emissions from electronic products (Rept. No. 1184). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1106. Resolution providing for the consideration of S. 2029, an act to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 relating to the application of certain standards to motor vehicles produced in quantities of less than 500 (Rept. No. 1185). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 16044. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize certain grants for assisting in improved operation of waste treatment plants; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DOLE:

H.R. 16045. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for expenses incurred by a taxpayer in making repairs and improvements to his residence, and to allow the owner of rental housing to amortize at an accelerated rate the cost of rehabilitating or restoring such housing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 16046. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to help secure safe community water supplies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 16047. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act by increasing the penalties for illegal manufacture and

traffic in hallucinogenic drugs (including LSD) and other depressant and stimulant drugs, including possession of such drugs for sale or other disposal to another, and by making it a misdemeanor to possess any such drug for one's own use except when prescribed or furnished by a licensed practitioner, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ESHLEMAN:

H.R. 16048. A bill to provide that Flag Day shall be a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 16049. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from the manufacturers excise tax automobiles sold to disabled veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia:

H.R. 16050. A bill to amend the Community Mental Health Centers Act to make provision for specialized facilities for alcoholics and narcotic addicts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 16051. A bill to extend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 16052. A bill to amend chapter 21 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide increased assistance for specially adapted housing for disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 16053. A bill to amend section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 to provide increased rent supplement payments in the case of tenants with larger families; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia:

H.R. 16054. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act and the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to exempt certain wages and salary of employees from withholding for tax purposes under the laws of States or subdivisions thereof other than the State or subdivision of the employee's residence; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 16055. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 16056. A bill to provide that Flag Day shall be a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENNEY:

H.R. 16057. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to abolish the renewal requirements for licenses in the safety and special radio services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 16058. A bill to impose, under certain conditions, import limitations on metal ores or metals during labor disputes affecting domestic production of such articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H.R. 16059. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to restore the provisions permitting the deduction, without regard to the 3- and 1-percent floors, of medical expenses incurred for the care of individuals 65 years of age and over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

H.R. 16060. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA (for himself, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. COHELAN, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GRAY, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PHILBIN, and Mr. SMITH of Iowa):

H.R. 16061. A bill to amend the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 to provide for the office of Poet Laureate of the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 16062. A bill to impose, under certain conditions, import limitations on metal ores or metals during labor disputes affecting domestic production of such articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY:

H.R. 16063. A bill to amend section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to continue the existing status of interest on industrial development bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN (for himself, Mr. BARRETT, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. REUSS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. MINISH, Mr. HANNA, Mr. GETTYS, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. REES, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. FINO, and Mr. WYLE):

H.R. 16064. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act with respect to the scope of the audit by the General Accounting Office; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SCHERLE (for himself and Mr. KYL):

H.R. 16065. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to release on behalf of the United States conditions in deeds conveying certain lands to the State of Iowa, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia (for himself, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. POLLOCK, Mr. RARICK, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ZABLOCKI, Mr. McCLOREY, and Mr. UTT):

H.R. 16066. A bill to permit American citizens to hold gold in the event of the removal of the requirement that gold reserves be held against currency in circulation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 16067. A bill to amend the provisions of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, relating to the application of the public information and disclosure provisions of such chapter; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. STUCKEY:

H.R. 16068. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BRINKLEY:

H.J. Res. 1176. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim August 11, 1968, as Family Reunion Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.J. Res. 1177. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim August 11, 1968, as Family Reunion Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARDNER:

H.J. Res. 1178. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim August 11, 1968, as Family Reunion Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAMILTON:

H.J. Res. 1179. Joint resolution to provide for the exclusion from gross income, under section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, of interest on industrial development bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.J. Res. 1180. Joint resolution designating the second Saturday in May of each year

as "National Fire Service Recognition Day," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.J. Res. 1181. Joint resolution designating the second Saturday in May of each year as "National Fire Service Recognition Day," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.J. Res. 1182. Joint resolution to declare the policy of the United States with respect to its territorial sea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.J. Res. 1183. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to conduct a comprehensive study and investigation of the existing compensation system for motor vehicle accident losses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.J. Res. 1184. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim August 11, 1968, as "Family Reunion Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. DEL CLAWSON, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DOLE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. LIPSCOMB, Mr. SHRIVER, and Mr. STEIGER of Arizona):

H.J. Res. 1185. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim August 11, 1968, as "Family Reunion Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.J. Res. 1186. Joint resolution to authorize a study and investigation of information service systems for States and localities designed to enable such States and localities to participate more effectively in federally assisted programs and to provide Congress and the President with a better measure of State and local needs and performance under these programs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.J. Res. 1187. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of Dr. Enrico Fermi; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BRINKLEY:

H. Con. Res. 714. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the tax-exempt status of interest on industrial development bonds should not be removed by administrative action; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H. Con. Res. 715. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the tax-exempt status of interest on industrial development bonds should not be removed by administrative action; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEE:

H. Con. Res. 716. Concurrent resolution relative to Citizens Radio Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H. Con. Res. 717. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the tax-exempt status of interest on industrial development bonds should not be removed by administrative action; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATTS:

H. Con. Res. 718. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the tax-exempt status of interest on industrial development bonds should not be removed by administrative action; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZION:

H. Con. Res. 719. Concurrent resolution requiring appropriate committees of the Congress to consider and report whether further congressional action is desirable in respect to U.S. policies in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee:

H. Con. Res. 720. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the tax-exempt status of interest on industrial development bonds should not be removed by administrative action; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PODELL:

H. Con. Res. 721. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the establishment of peace in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE (for himself and Mr. MacGREGOR):

H. Con. Res. 722. Concurrent resolution calling upon the President to investigate the plight of the victims of the Sicilian earthquakes and, if necessary, direct the Attorney General to take appropriate action under the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. Con. Res. 723. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to take action to insure the United States will derive maximum benefits from an expanded and intensified effort to increase the accuracy and extend the time range of weather predictions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H. Res. 1107. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to change the name of the Committee on Banking and Currency to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUTTON:

H.R. 16069. A bill for the relief of Mr. Jan Pawelczak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 16070. A bill for the relief of Tove Belstrup Nielsen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 16071. A bill for the relief of Miss Sofia Rodriguez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 16072. A bill for the relief of Josef Arsoni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 16073. A bill for the relief of Antonietta Maria Calone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16074. A bill for the relief of Franco Geralmo Giraudo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 16075. A bill for the relief of Francesco Paolo Fiordimondo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 16076. A bill for the relief of John P. Skjold, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 16077. A bill authorizing the payment of retired pay to Lawrence E. Ellis; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 16078. A bill for the relief of Antonio Mateus dos Santos-Cruz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 16079. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Domenico Marino and their children, Ciriaco, Adelaide, Gaetano, Elvira, Gerardo, and Carmine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PIKE:

H.R. 16080. A bill for the relief of Antonio

and Adelina Pirozzolo and their two children, Marino and Marco Pirozzolo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POCELL:

H.R. 16081. A bill for the relief of Cosima Bellucci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POLANCO-ABREU:

H.R. 16082. A bill for the relief of Maria del

Carmen Marciano-Soltero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 16083. A bill for the relief of Carmela Toschi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 16084. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sophia Takacs and Sophia Kondor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

265. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the National Farmers Union, Washington, D.C., relative to the civil rights bill, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

American Involvement in Vietnam

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, several weeks ago I had the privilege of seeing a film by David Schoenbrun, former CBS correspondent, entitled "Vietnam: How Did We Get In; How Can We Get Out?" That film is a human document of American involvement in Vietnam. It presents a well-reasoned program for peace by a man who has known North Vietnamese President Ho Chi Minh for 21 years, who was the only American journalist to witness the French defeat at Dien Bien Phu, and who recently returned from a 6-week trip to Hanoi.

David Schoenbrun calls for American extrication from Vietnam. Yet he is neither traitor nor pacifist. He is one of those rare men who have witnessed history in the making, who have known the men who moved history, and who have recorded it all with freedom and objectivity.

Schoenbrun's demand for a new Vietnam policy is anything but a radical denial of God and country. It is an assertion that this is a great Nation led momentarily off course; it is a call to set a Nation straight.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Schoenbrun film be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the text was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. SCHOENBRUN. When I say that I'm pleased to be in San Francisco, I really mean it. It's a great pleasure. It may also be the last pleasurable thing that I will say to you today, for there is nothing pleasurable in discussing Vietnam.

I'd like to address myself with you to the questions that all Americans are asking, and to invite you to walk down the paths of history with me, for I have lived the answers to these questions in twenty-one years of my life.

Let's begin with the first question: How did we get into it in the first place? For me, this question began many, many years ago, when I was a young intelligence officer on the Staff of General Eisenhower. And in going through our intelligence reports, I saw that some colleagues of mine, Colonel Gallagher, Major Patti, and others, had been sent to a country named Vietnam about which I knew almost nothing. They had been sent to the north of that country to make contact with a great patriot who was fighting for the independence of his country, fighting against the Japanese, a man who was our ally in this great world struggle. I'll give you one guess—and one, only—of the name of this great patriot now. Yes, that's right—Ho Chi Minh.

Ho Chi Minh, the patriotic ally of the United States, today is a villain and our enemy. What has happened in two decades to change him from a patriot and ally to a villain and an enemy? In what way has he changed? Well, I have known Ho Chi Minh for twenty years—twenty-one years, exactly—from the first day I met him in June of 1946 to the last time I met him in August, 1967, just a few weeks ago. I must tell you that Ho Chi Minh has not changed. He is today what he was then, a dedicated Communist revolutionary. He was fighting for the independence of his country against the French colonial empire and against the Japanese invaders. He is still fighting for the independence of his country. He wants it to be a free country. He also wants it to be a Communist country. We knew that when we were allied with him.

So what, in fact, has changed? We have changed. Twenty-five years ago we were allied with the Communists—we were allies with the Soviet Union in the war against the forces of darkness of Hitler and of Tojo. We were also true to our most cherished traditions of anti-colonialism. We are the world's greatest anti-colonial power, or used to be. We threw off the yoke of tyranny—from Britain. We have always dedicated ourselves to freedom for subject people. That's one reason why we supported Ho Chi Minh, and many other peoples around the world who, in the wake of World War II's destruction of the old European colonial empires, were seeking freedom and independence. And we, under a great President—Franklin Delano Roosevelt—were dedicated to those goals. I was proud to be an American soldier fighting under the flag of the four freedoms, as well as our own beloved flag, the Stars and Stripes. I was proud to be a member of the country whose President said that we were not fighting the war to restore the colonial empires of France, Britain, Holland, Portugal but fighting for freedom.

I remember what other people's reactions were. What a wonderful feeling to be an American in those days! People's eyes would light up. Our country was the inspiration and the aspiration of all people. And it was grand to be an American to see people standing up and hoping for freedom. That's what Ho Chi Minh stood up for. That's what Ho Chi Minh hoped for. And that's what we were helping him to do until President Roosevelt died. Then the war ended and the allied coalition died too. The Cold War with the Soviet Union began. I supported the Truman Doctrine; I supported the Marshall Plan; I supported our entering the war in Korea. I tell you this because I want you to know that I am not a dove, and I hate the word dove, or hawk, or eagle, or owl, or any other of the creatures of the aviary of American politics. I'm a human being; I'm a man; my name is David Schoenbrun, and I am opposed to this war because it is cruel and unjust and immoral, and cannot be won. And I have reached that conclusion, not because I'm a dove, but because I'm a man, and I've got brains, and I'm a free man. And I've watched it, and studied it, and participated in it. I am covered with wounds from war; I have covered wars for a long time. Some wars are just, and I will fight; some wars are unjust, and I will fight against them. That's why I'm doing this today. I want you to know

there's no pleasure or privilege or profit in standing up and fighting the government this way. This is my duty as an American citizen to do. And, thank God, I still live in a country where it's possible to do so. The government isn't very happy about it, but there's nothing it can do to halt dissent.

Mr. Johnson admits that dissent is a tradition and basic right of our country. Of course, what he really says is, "I'm in favor of dissent, just so long as you don't criticize me." But he's going to have to stand still for the criticism. As we review the record of how we got in, it's a sorry record.

Ho Chi Minh, fired up by the talk of the four freedoms, determined to free his country, came out of the underground when the Japanese surrendered in August 1945. He went to Hanoi with his people and he proclaimed the Republic of Vietnam. And he read to them the Constitution, which he drafted in the underground, while fighting the Japanese. It began with these words, "We hold these truths to be self-evident." He translated the American Declaration of Independence and offered it to his country.

There were people who said then, and people who would say, "Oh, that's a cunning Communist play, a play for American sympathy." All right. Maybe it was. But what an inspiring play! Isn't it nice that someone should seek American sympathy by translating our Declaration of Independence? Anybody who wants to be cunning by translating our own beloved birth certificate, be my guest, because that's the kind of cunning that I like. Ho offered this document to his people; his people acclaimed him. And he became the President of Vietnam. And the French, who were too weakened by war to reconquer their colonies had nothing to do but accept it. Oh, they had mental reservations, and they were plotting to reconquer Indochina, but, in the winter 1945-1946 there was nothing they could do but accept the reality that Ho Chi Minh was the leader of his people. And this is important. They signed a convention with him, on March 6, 1946, recognizing Viet Nam to be "a free State."

Remember the date and the event when you discuss this war in Vietnam.

Americans are decent people, and Americans want to do what's right. I am sure the great majority of our citizens do not want to play a power political game unless justice is on our side. But justice is not on our side, and the facts will show it.

They signed the convention on the 6th of March, 1946, recognized Ho Chi Minh as President of Vietnam; this was accepted by the United States of America. At the same time, the Emperor of Indo-China, Bao Dai, abdicated his throne; took his birth name, citizen Vinh Thuy, became political counsel under Ho Chi Minh. So Ho had the recognition of France and he had the legitimacy of the dynasty. Nobody challenged his right to be President of Vietnam; not North Vietnam, or South Vietnam, but Vietnam, the one country shaped like an hour-glass that runs from the Chinese mountains down to the Gulf of Siam. One people, one language, one culture with aspirations for unity that they have fought for two thousand years. No other man has ever been elected and recognized as the President of Vietnam. Ho Chi Minh is the only legitimate leader of his country. I'm not his advocate. I regret the fact he is a Communist.

But this is reality. As President of Vietnam, he was invited by the President of France to come to Paris and to meet at Fontainebleau in the outskirts of Paris at a conference to work out the terms of a new relationship. Now that they were free—they were still poor, miserable, wretched—they needed the help of a larger power, so they turned to France, for all of them had been educated by the French. For 100 years French was their language. The French were a people with whom they'd establish trade and cultural patterns.

And, so, the French said, "Very well. We'll create something new called 'L'Union Française.' It was a nice round phrase, 'French union', signifying nothing, but sounding noble, which is the way de Gaulle likes to conduct foreign affairs.

Ho had no choice but to try to negotiate with them. And so he did. And, rapidly, he saw that the negotiations were a fraud. He told this to me and to other reporters every single day. You know what the French demanded in this new partnership? They said, "Well, we are the most experienced country, so we will be responsible for diplomacy in all of the commonwealth. All of your embassies will be inside of ours. Of course, we're the great power, so we'll be in charge of national defense; and, of course, the economics of the commonwealth; and, of course, we will handle customs and immigration." Ho said, "It won't work; a war's going to break out." And I said "How can you fight the modern army of France?" Ho replied: "We have a secret weapon that is called nationalism." I'm afraid I kind of snickered when he said that. And he said, "It's ill-befitting an American to laugh. Your country is founded on the love of nation. Your country's nationalism is a great motivating force. And don't ask me how can I fight against the French. I saw pictures in your history books of your wretched bands of guerrillas led by General Washington. Why, they didn't even have shoes. I saw the blood-stained rags, and you're proud of those blood-stained rags. Why do you then say to me that I can't do it?"

I said, "Well, President Ho, I meant no offense, sir, but that was in the 18th Century. Today, in the 20th Century the weapons of war are more powerful." Ho replied: "Remember my words. In the mid twentieth century, man's hunger for freedom is greater than it even was in the 18th century. And the hunger for freedom is greater than weapons. Never forget that."

Ho went on: "Let me tell you what kind of a war it's going to be. It's going to be a war between an elephant and a tiger. If the tiger of Indo-China is ever caught out in the open by the elephant of France, it will be pierced by the mighty tusks and trampled under, but it won't be caught because we're going to lurk in the forest, and in our jungles by day, and steal out by night and leap upon the back of the elephant, gouging huge chunks out, and slowly, the elephant of France, bleeding, will sink exhausted into our paddles."

That was August, 1946. Some of you may remember my broadcast about the elephant and the tiger, a prediction of the war—and it was fought exactly that way—when it broke out as he predicted it would. When did it break out? You ought to know this too. It broke out in November, 1946. How and under what conditions? The French sent their men to the port of Haiphong to control it. Ho Chi Minh's men said, "This is our country; this is our fort; get out." The French wouldn't. There was a fight. Seven Vietnamese were killed; two Frenchmen were killed too.

Do you know what the French did? Their Navy lined up four capital ships in front of the open port of Haiphong and cannonaded for four hours—a massacre of 14,000 people in one afternoon. That's in the Archives of the French Navy. I've seen that document. That document is reprinted in

Ellen Hammer's book, "The Struggle for Indo-China." Fourteen thousand people massacred in one afternoon by the country of liberty, equality, fraternity. What a denial of the magnificent culture of France. What a denial of Christianity and of democracy. This is only one example of treachery, duplicity and cruelty that make up the tragic story of Indo-China and of this unfortunate country, Vietnam.

The Vietnamese struck back because of the attack on Haiphong, just as they are striking back today, just as today, Ho Chi Minh and Phan Van Dong have announced that no longer will they even consider talking with the United States unless we stop bombing unconditionally. Why? Because we are massively striking at that same port of Haiphong and at the city of Hanoi. We are bombing them to try to force them to bow their heads and bend their knees, and they won't do it. They are self-respecting people. That's what courage takes. And the Vietnamese have got that courage in very large quantities.

I wish that these people were on our side—and they could have been. How they begged to be on our side. Ho Chi Minh begged me, back in 1946, "Get me a visa to Washington. I want to talk to the Americans." And they wouldn't talk to him because the Cold War was on with Russia. We did not at first help the French either, for we did not want to support an imperial power. But then something happened. The Communists defeated Chiang Kai-shek in China in December of 1949. The French went racing to Washington, to the State Department, and said, "Now, now, what do you see? China is on our frontier. Now it's a crusade against Communism. It's no longer a colonial war." And we bought it. We bought it because our country was living in fear and panic, back in those days. It is no coincidence that the first speech of Joseph McCarthy came in January of 1950, just when Red China came into the picture. And, so we began—to support the French in a colonial war of conquest. For four years, from '50 to '54, we gave them \$3 billion. We, Americans, supported a colonial war, trying to suppress people fighting for freedom. That was a shame on the record of our country, because our anti-colonialism had been superceded by anti-Communism. Everything fell into line for anti-Communism. We would align ourselves with fascists. We would align ourselves with the worst elements in the world if only they were anti-Communist. This was a self defeating policy and it failed for Communists had identified themselves with that secret weapon that Ho Chi Minh had told us about, nationalism. And the people fought and defeated the French at the battle of Dien Bien Phu. I was the only American at that battle of Dien Bien Phu and I saw the end come for western domination in Asia. Everybody knew it was the end; everybody except John Foster Dulles; he wouldn't accept the fact.

And I saw what followed in Geneva. I went to the Geneva Conference. My fellow Americans, I ask you to study very carefully what happened at that Geneva Conference. This is the crux of the whole matter. If you want to know where justice is, what cause you should support, and whether your Government is telling you the truth or not, you've got to know what happened at the meeting.

At the Geneva Conference the Russians and the Chinese told Phan Van Dong, representing Ho, that it would be better to agree to a cease-fire and the scheduling of free elections rather than to keep fighting and take the country by force. Yes, the record shows that the Communists proposed the ballot box instead of the battlefield. They had good reasons to do so.

In the last days of Dien Bien Phu, the French asked us to drop the bomb around Dien Bien Phu to save the garrison. And Dulles approved. So did Admiral Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs. But President

Eisenhower vetoed it. Even though Ike turned it down, the Chinese were still worried that if the Vietnamese pressed too hard, there might be an American intervention. The Chinese didn't want war at that time. They didn't want to get involved in it at all.

And so, Ho Chi Minh said, "All right, I'll stop fighting, and, in return, we'll have free elections." He knew he was going to win the election.

Eisenhower, in his memoirs, states that Ho would have won eighty percent of the vote. Now, it doesn't matter who wrote Eisenhower's memoirs, he signed them and he's responsible for the statement. The Geneva Conference agreed on a cease-fire to be followed by elections. But the U.S. supported dictator Ngo Dinh Diem in Saigon, who refused to permit elections. Now, we're supposed to be in favor of free elections, you know. Apparently, though, only if we're sure we're going to win. You might call that the Cook County syndrome in world affairs. Well, the Communists gave up the territory they held in the South. They moved north of the 17th parallel to await elections and, by the way, I quote to you from the Geneva Treaty: The 17th parallel was described as a "temporary, military demarcation line"—temporary, not permanent; military, not political; demarcation, not frontier. It went further and said, "At no time shall this be considered to be a territorial frontier." It was a military line, between two "zones" of the one country, Vietnam. Never was the word "North" or "South Vietnam" mentioned in the Treaty, only Vietnam.

Now, I ask you to read that Treaty for yourselves: "Cease-fire, withdrawal to a demarcation line, free elections to be held in 1956." And, very important, my fellow Americans, in 1955, one year before the election, representatives of the two zones were to meet and determine the conditions for elections. In other words, to lay down the terms under which the elections can be free. Isn't that a magnificent agreement? Isn't that what we Americans want? No, it isn't what we want, I regret to say, for we refused to go ahead with the deal. We put into a power, a Catholic, Mandarin dictator, Ngo Dinh Diem. He was not elected by the Vietnamese people and he's the man who we made our agreement with, and when Mr. Rusk tells you that we're in that country by the invitation of the government that is untrue. We are there by the invitation of ourselves. We put Ngo Dinh Diem in. We made a deal with him. And then, later, we backed all the generals after they murdered him. We have, from the start, supported a minority military movement against a majority of the Vietnamese people who would have voted for Ho Chi Minh. That is part of history and nobody can deny it.

The real truth is that we wouldn't hold the elections and that we never intended to. And Ngo Dinh Diem, whom we supported, four days before the first meeting of an electoral commission to set the terms of a free election, announced that he would not meet with Communists, wouldn't even discuss the question. Not one meeting took place. This is a shame. This is something the United States of America does not stand for, and yet we stood for it. We made a mistake because Joe McCarthy was talking about a world Communist conspiracy. And John Foster Dulles, who had made his career by charging the Democratic Party with giving China to the Reds, was not, himself, going to preside over the loss of Indo-China to the Reds, giving the Democrats the chance to attack him. For internal political reasons; because of the hysteria of the moment, we betrayed our most precious heritage of American traditions. And I say we have to get back and be Americans again. I say that what we did then, and what we have done since, is un-American. And I say that I am not the dissenter; the real dissenter is Lyndon B. Johnson. He has dissented from what he said in 1964 when we

elected him to make peace in Vietnam, not to make war. He promised us that he would not make a wider war. He promised us that he would not escalate it. He said, October 12, 1964, "I will not send American boys to do the job that Asian boys should do for themselves." And he has sent American boys to do the job. This is a disgrace. That disgrace began at the Geneva Conference. Read the history of it. Read too the SEATO treaty that follows it and you will see that Mr. Rusk is not telling the truth about the SEATO treaty any more than about the Geneva treaty, for SEATO does not commit us to defend South Viet Nam.

You are businessmen; you understand a contract. The contract of Geneva said this to the Communists: Withdraw from the territory in the South, go north of the 17th parallel and wait for elections. After the elections the country will be reunified.

The Communists kept their part of the contract and went North to await elections. But the second half of the contract was broken. Elections were denied to them. So they went back and picked up their arms once again—that is to the state of affairs precedent to the broken contract—This is what Mr. Rusk calls an aggression. This is not an aggression. The Communists were fighting French colonialists. Then we intervened to change the course of Vietnamese history. That is the truth.

Eisenhower began the process by giving money and arms to Saigon. Then Kennedy sent advisors to Vietnam. Then we elected Mr. Johnson to make peace, and he made war instead, because the situation had deteriorated and the junta would not or could not fight the Communists. So Johnson sent American men in to make it an American war. That is the sad story of the history of Vietnam and the American involvement, and I would say we must change it.

Wars are really ended in one of two ways: either when one side is so much stronger than the other that it can crush it totally, or when one side gets weary of the war and is willing to pay a price to end it. So what is involved here is not a formula, but a will. Do we have the will, and does the majority of the American people support the will to make any sacrifice necessary to spill all the blood that has to be spilled to defeat the people of Vietnam? I believe we do not have that will and should not have that will. The people of Vietnam will never surrender to us. They'll fight on until the end, which means that we would have to have a policy of genocide. We'd have to wipe them out completely. We are already well away along that line, but we cannot go to the end of the line. I don't think the American people will support genocide. Perhaps we would rather be dead than Red but we can't make that choice for other peoples. Short of genocide by nuclear fusion we cannot defeat the Vietnamese.

To win a war an army must physically occupy the ground. I'm an old infantry man and I know that the Air Force does not win wars. We've got to occupy the grounds. You can't win a war by air power.

It has been estimated by the Rand Corporation, in special studies, that it could take as many as ten million American soldiers to defeat the Viet Cong and to occupy the territory of South Vietnam. Where are we going to get ten million people, or even five million, or even two million American soldiers? That means mobilizing the Reserves; that means ending college deferments, and calling up all of our youngsters, including those from white middle-class homes to fight this war. I doubt that even President Johnson would dare do it. So, I believe that we can't win the war. If we can't win the war, we've got then to decide how we are going to get out of it. We must build up at least a very significant minority—we don't even need a majority—but we need a large enough minority, and a responsible enough, and a

distinguished enough, and an important enough minority to convince the administration—or to change the administration—to show that the American people want to end this war and the American people want to get out of Vietnam. Now this involves some very bitter pills the American people are not yet willing to swallow, but they're going to have to—that is because they have to get out of Vietnam.

Now there are people saying, "We can't turn tail and run. We're a great power." And I agree. You make a mess, and you don't run away from it—you've got to clean the mess up.

How do we clean it up? What's an honorable settlement? An honorable settlement is based upon a tradition to which we Americans are, in principle, committed, and that every American Republican or Democrat, or whatever—can accept; self-determination of the people of Vietnam without coercion from the outside.

How do we accomplish this? We have to accept the basic principle of the Geneva Accords, which we violated in the period of 1954 to 1956. We have to accept general elections for South Vietnam, and an Assembly in South Vietnam, which will choose its own government and make its own decisions. And it's none of our business what that government is. If it's going to be Communist, then it's going to be Communist; that's their business, not ours. And our security is not affected very much by anything that can happen there. So, I say the first step—the most important step—is stop bombing; deescalate; bring about a change in the climate which will permit free elections to be held.

The first step in that direction is to stop bombing. Let us examine this question of bombing. Why should we stop bombing? Mr. McNamara has testified to the Senate Subcommittee on Preparedness—that the bombing had failed in its purposes. It had not stopped the supply and infiltration routes to South Vietnam. The Communist armies there need 100 tons a day—and those hundred tons are being supplied. I am an eye witness to that supply system. They use bicycles. I have seen bicycles with wooden planks fastened over the back wheel with straw baskets at either end, fifty pounds per basket, 100 pounds per bicycle, one ton for every twenty bicycles—tens of thousands of bicycles are going down that road—a hundred tons a day is a cinch; you can't stop them. It's like trying to fight a swarm of mosquitoes with a sledge hammer; try it some time. We're so big and strong that we can destroy the biggest power on earth, but we can't destroy all the bicycles in a rural country. Our strength is not meant for that kind of a situation.

I crossed rivers without bridges. How do you cross a river without a bridge? They poled sampans—flat-bottomed boats—down the river and then lashed them together with pontoons and laid over it a carpet of wooden planks. I've seen ten ton trucks go over these "floating bridges".

I was there one day on a dike at 2:00 o'clock in the morning when one of these ten ton trucks went over the bridge. As it came to the embankment the left rear wheel sunk in the mud over the hubcap, and I thought to myself, well, that's it. Even in America, it would take you hours to get a power winch to pull that out of a mudhole. Do you know how long it took them to do it without a power winch? Forty-five minutes. I watched them do it. The leader blew a whistle. Out of the village came the people, like ants, each one with a pail and a shovel and with ropes. I watched fifty of them lash their bare backs to the front fender of that truck, while, in the back, others came with gravel and sand and shovels. They dug the mud out, and as they were taking the mud away from the wheel of this truck, others were pouring sand and gravel into the mud hole, while, up in front, fifty of them were straining against the ropes. And, all of a

sudden, with a tremendous pop, the ten ton truck shot out of that mud hole. You can't stop people like that.

Now, if we can't stop them, and Mr. McNamara has admitted it; if we cannot bomb them to the peace table, as Mr. McNamara has admitted; and if we are losing \$2 billion worth of planes in an air campaign which can't succeed, I say stop the bombing. First step, stop bombing—unconditionally. Not a bombing pause. Remember, there's a difference. For them, a bombing pause is putting a cocked pistol on the table and saying, "I will stop shooting, but I want to see whether you will do what I want you to do. And if you don't, I'll shoot at you again." That is an ultimatum, not a peace offer. And they will not accept it. And they're prepared to fight on as long as is necessary, and they're sure that they can outlast us. I think they can too.

They have lost practically all. Their steel mills have been destroyed; their homes have been destroyed; they've got nothing left much to lose. We have a lot to lose. Our economy's at stake. You're businessmen; you know what that means. So stop bombing, start talking. Call for an international conference to arrange a cease-fire to be followed by elections.

Let those elections be held and let the results be whatever they be. Let us withdraw the American Army during the cease-fire and before the elections take place so that we can't be accused of controlling them.

This will not be easy to arrange but it was done before, from the battle of Dien Bien Phu to the Peace of Geneva. We can do it again and this time respect the Peace Treaty and make it stick as it would have if we had not broken it.

There are people who through misguided versions of patriotism think that we must, nonetheless, support our country and fight on even though it is wrong. They subscribe to the juvenile thinking of Stephen Decatur, who said, "Our country, may she always be right. But our country, right or wrong." I prefer the words of another great patriot, Carl Schurz, who was misquoted by Decatur. He said: "Our country, right or wrong—If right, let us preserve the right; if wrong, let us make it right." That's what free men can do.

Results of Questionnaire in the Third District of Michigan

HON. GARRY BROWN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, last fall I sent the residents of Michigan's Third Congressional District a questionnaire designed to elicit their feelings about many of today's pressing national concerns. The response was gratifying and the results have been most helpful to me. More than 18,000 individual forms were returned and many of these had additional comments.

With the thought that other Members might be interested in the thinking of my constituents, though belatedly reflected, I am inserting at this point in the RECORD, the questionnaire and its results stated in percentages:

I. STATE OF THE BUDGET AND THE ECONOMY

In a special message to Congress the President made the following recommendations. Do you support these recommendations?

A. Reduce the anticipated \$29 billion budget deficit to \$22.7 billion by imposing a 10%

temporary increases in individual and corporate income taxes? 19.6% yes, 80.4% no.

B. Postpone from April 1, 1968, until July 1, 1969, the reduction of the auto and telephone service excise taxes thereby reducing the anticipated budget deficit by an additional \$300 million. 60.8% yes, 39.2% no.

C. Send an additional 45,000 troops to Vietnam at an estimated cost of \$4 billion (this cost is included in the \$29 billion anticipated deficit), 30.3% yes, 69.7% no.

II. POVERTY—RACIAL IMBALANCE—EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

A. Is the taxpayer being required to contribute as much as he should to improve the standard of living, correct racial imbalance, provide equal opportunity? 87.5% yes, 12.5% no.

B. Is the taxpayer's dollar being used as effectively as it should to achieve the best results in the above areas? 5.8% yes, 94.2% no.

C. With respect to the following programs, would you:

	Percent
Manpower development and training:	
Increase funding	73.6
Reduce funding	26.4
Model cities:	
Increase funding	21.5
Reduce funding	78.5
Rent supplements:	
Increase funding	16.9
Reduce funding	83.1
Headstart:	
Increase funding	58.9
Reduce funding	41.1
Neighborhood Youth Corps:	
Increase funding	59.6
Reduce funding	40.4
Job Corps:	
Increase funding	40.0
Reduce funding	60.0
VISTA:	
Increase funding	41.0
Reduce funding	59.0
Water and sewage grants:	
Increase funding	63.6
Reduce funding	36.4
Community action program:	
Increase funding	48.8
Reduce funding	51.2

III. RIOTS—LAW ENFORCEMENT

A. Are the current riots caused by conditions of poverty in our central cities and slum areas?

[In percentages]

Yes 43.4
No 56.6

B. Are the riots caused by a breakdown in our law enforcement procedures?

Yes 67.9
No 32.1

C. If you answered (A) "yes," what particular conditions do you think are prime contributors to riots and, therefore, in greatest need of improvement?

Rat control and extermination	18.3
Job training and availability	43.5
Pure racial antagonism	29.0
Recreational programs	18.3
Substandard housing	30.9
Education	49.7

D. If you answered (B) "yes," do you think the law enforcement breakdown stems from:

1. Police improprieties or brutality?
Yes 10.3
No 89.7

2. Police inadequacies, such as:
a. Lack of personnel 44.8
b. Lack of adequate pay 43.6
c. Lack of training 33.2
d. Lack of understanding of condition of slum dwellers, etc. 17.2

3. Activities, opinions, or interpretations of the law by the courts?

Yes 89.5
No 10.5

4. If you answered (3) "yes," do you think:

a. The courts are making it too easy for those charged with crimes to go free?
Yes 93.6
No 6.4

b. The courts are too lenient in sentencing convicted criminals?
Yes 91.9
No 8.1

c. The courts are too "liberal" in interpreting the law, thereby permitting the end or cause to justify means?
Yes 92.2
No 7.8

d. Federal judges at all levels should be appointed for definite terms rather than serve for life as at present?
Yes 87.5
No 12.5

IV. FOREIGN RELATIONS AND FOREIGN AID

A. What is your opinion regarding the degree of the present Administration's participation in alliances, engagements, conflicts, etc., with other nations?

1. We are too involved internationally? 79.9
2. We are not involved enough? 5.6
3. Our foreign policy is about right? 14.5

B. Do you think:

1. We should make every reasonable attempt to improve relations with the "East," or Soviet-bloc countries through:
a. Expanding trade in goods considered nonstrategic but beneficial to their economy?
Yes 65.7
No 34.3

b. Expanding our exchange of educational, vocational, and nonmilitary technological ideas and experts?
Yes 73.4
No 26.6

c. Furnishing greater assistance by direct financial aid, credit, or goods such as foodstuffs?
Yes 17.0
No 83.0

2. We should forget about reaching an "understanding" with the Soviet Union and its satellites and take a "tougher" attitude toward them as the only way to improve substantially our foreign relations posture and protect our national security?
Yes 46.6
No 53.4

C. What do you think we should do, with respect to our foreign aid program in the following areas?

[In percentages]

Latin America:
Keep as is 34.5
Increase 40.9
Reduce 14.5
Eliminate 10.1

Arab-bloc nations:
Keep as is 17.8
Increase 4.4
Reduce 30.1
Eliminate 47.7

Israel:
Keep as is 41.5
Increase 17.7
Reduce 22.2
Eliminate 18.6

Western Europe:
Keep as is 31.5
Increase 4.6
Reduce 34.2
Eliminate 29.7

Great Britain and Commonwealth:

Keep as is 34.3
Increase 9.1
Reduce 26.7
Eliminate 29.9

Soviet-bloc nations:

Keep as is 18.5
Increase 6.3
Reduce 21.5
Eliminate 53.7

Southeast Asia (SEATO countries):

Keep as is 36.4
Increase 17.4
Reduce 26.0
Eliminate 20.2

Africa:

Keep as is 32.4
Increase 21.4
Reduce 22.3
Eliminate 23.9

D. Our foreign aid program should have as its primary objectives:

[In percentages]

1. Charity toward all countries and peoples less fortunate than ourselves:
Yes 32.6
No 67.4

2. Improvement of the economy and self-sufficiency of any nation which has a potential for friendship and for adopting democratic principles:
Yes 81.1
No 18.9

3. Assistance only to friends and allies and no help to others:
Yes 54.5
No 45.5

V. VIETNAM

A. Should we continue the policy of the present Administration?

Yes 18.1
No 81.9

B. Should we escalate military operations?

Yes 50.6
No 49.4

C. What should be our policy regarding bombing raids on North Vietnam? Check one:

Step up bombing and expand the type of targets 67.2

Bomb only limited, strategic installations as at present 13.9

Refrain from bombing altogether 18.9

D. Should we increase efforts to pacify and stabilize economic, political, and social conditions in South Vietnam?

Yes 68.3
No 31.7

E. Should we make an all-out peace negotiation effort; and if it fails, withdraw to positions we can hold militarily, politically, and economically?

Yes 54.1
No 45.9

F. If negotiations fail, should we withdraw altogether?

Yes 42.5
No 57.5

Better Business Mail Service

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks a letter from Mr. Charles Ming, who is the building man-

ager of the United Founders Life Tower, in Oklahoma City, Okla.

Mr. Ming's letter points out the outstanding success of the VIM program—that means vertical improved mail—in this new building in northwest Oklahoma City.

His letter is another testimonial to the significant progress in the modernization and improved mail service characterized in the Post Office Department under the leadership of the Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED FOUNDERS LIFE INSURANCE CO.,
Oklahoma City, Okla., March 13, 1968.
Senator MIKE MONRONEY,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONRONEY: Since June 12, 1967, when two mail deliveries were established in the United Founders Life Tower through the installation of a full time delivery station in our lobby, it has appeared as though the entire economy of the United Founders Life Plaza and the business community in Northwest Oklahoma City has increased substantially.

At the end of February, 1968, our occupancy rate for this twenty story building was 97%, making us full for all practical purposes.

I am convinced that the establishment of your VIM program and the full time delivery station in our building has been one of the major factors in the rapid development of this business community, as the occupants of the area know that they have mail service equivalent to the downtown metropolitan area, if not better service.

Mail service is, as you know, extremely important to the many offices and businesses located in this area and it is extremely gratifying to all of us here, and especially to myself, that you and the Post Office Department have been able to see and share our optimistic feeling concerning the development of this area.

In addition to our success in the investment in the United Founders Life Tower, the National Foundation Life Building located immediately west and across Northwest Highway, has been extremely successful by achieving 100% occupancy in a short period of time. Their optimism is once again being demonstrated by the recent commencement of their second ten story tower within their office complex.

I have extended my thanks to you for your help in this project previously and I would like to take this opportunity to do so again. We are very happy with the service and hope that the Post Office Department will see fit to continue to work toward expansion of the services as required, feeling free to call on me at any time for any help or assistance that I may be able to render.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES MING.

Congressman Kupferman and the Hungarian Freedom Fighters

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, my colleague and friend, Congressman THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN, of the 17th Congressional District, has always been a firm

supporter of self-determination for the people of Hungary.

On March 17, 1968, at Hunter College in the 17th Congressional District, he joined in commemorating the Hungarian freedom fighters of 1848 and 1956.

His address follows:

Today we assemble again to pay homage to a generation of Hungarian freedom-fighters; men who heard clearly the appeal of the 19th century liberals against absolutist rule and took arms against an emperor who had originally approved and then refused to grant constitutional government to the Hungarian nation based on parliamentary principles.

Their names, beginning with the unforgettable hero of Hungarian and world freedom, Louis Kossuth, is too well-known even in America to need a lengthy introduction. He is even better known to those, who were brought up in the old country and who rightly look upon him as a national hero, a fighter for liberty and justice, and a protector and defender of the weak, and the liberator of the Hungarian peasantry. We also are aware of the leading and guiding poetical light of the heroic period of 1848-49, Alexander Petöfi who, though dying in battle at the age of 26 had bequeathed to the Hungarian literature a heritage which has hardly been surpassed.

Today, I would like to concentrate upon those heroes of the Hungarian fight for freedom who, like you, have come to the American shores and spending the remainder of their life in the United States, contributed militarily and scientifically, politically and journalistically as well to the welfare of this country in its trying and fateful days of the American Civil War between 1861-1865, and who fought for the same freedom and liberties on the side of President Lincoln for which they were willing to shed their blood in Kossuth's armies against the absolutist rule of the Hapsburg Court in 1848.

Being from New York, the man closest to our heart and memory is Brigadier General Alexander Asboth, who later also served under General Grant as United States Minister to Argentina, Paraguay and Uruguay. His name and military fame must be familiar to you, but let me now recount also, other events of his distinguished career so that in him today we may equally commemorate and hail the loyal American, the Hungarian patriot, the military leader, the engineer and diplomat and, last but not least, the fighter against injustice and for individual and human rights and freedoms. That fight is not finished, and we in America, and the Hungarian people everywhere will always continue to stand for freedom.

Alexander Asboth was born in 1811 in Western Hungary from a family of English descent. One of his ancestors was the court chaplain of Prince Emery Thököly, the stepfather of the first Hungarian freedomfighter, Prince Francis Rakoczy II. His father was a professor of agricultural sciences, the curator of Geogikon.

Graduated as an engineer, he joined the dapper regiments of Kossuth in 1848, and took part in several battles of the 1848-49 Hungarian fight for freedom. At the fateful day at Temesvar in August 1848 he chose Kossuth over the army command and accompanied him into exile in Turkey and was not separated from him until the time came for both to come to America. Asboth arrived into our city on the steamer *Mississippi* in November, 1851. Upon arriving here he immediately declared his intention of becoming a citizen, because he felt that the United States was to become his permanent home.

Louis Kossuth arrived on December 5 but after a short reunion, they separated again. Asboth could not accompany his Hungarian

comrade on his speaking tour that was to take him to Washington where he had the privilege of addressing the United States Congress, but kept in touch with him and was involved in buying arms and ammunition for the Kossuth forces.

In America Asboth worked as an architect, was employed by a firm at Syracuse, N.Y., then temporarily he went west as a mining engineer. Coming back to New York he opened a small steel foundry. In this business venture he has been moderately successful until his partner absconded. The failure forced him to accept city employment. He thus became an engineer with the City Planning Commission. In this capacity he had a prominent role in planning Washington Heights and also the famous Central Park in my 17th Congressional District.

Nine years after his arrival to America, the United States faced a crisis of unprecedented magnitude. The existence of the Union was at stake, and the man who fought for freedom in Hungary could not help but choose the side which was to fight against slavery and for the maintenance of national unity against secessionist forces. He asked Governor Morgan of New York to organize a regiment, but the plans did not work out. Thus, Alexander Asboth went west again where the 1856 Republican Presidential candidate, John C. Fremont was raising a Union army in Missouri. In July 1861 he was already chief of staff of General Fremont who, on September 26, 1861 appointed him a Brigadier General and entrusted him with the command of one of his divisions. General Asboth's commission was approved by Congress in March 1862. By that time, however, the General had distinguished himself not only as a trusted staff officer of General Fremont, but also of his successors, Generals Hunter and Curtis. His valor was amply shown in the battles of Bentonville and Fayetteville, Arkansas and in the battle of Pea Ridge in Arkansas where despite his wound, was back in saddle the next morning and led his troops to victory.

Upon the clearing of Missouri from Southern forces, General Asboth was ordered to Kentucky. Later he was entrusted with the command of the West Florida Department at Fort Pickens. He was severely wounded in the battle of Marianna. His left arm was shattered in two places by bullets. Another bullet entered the right side of his face, and it was never possible to remove it. This injury was very painful and hastened his early death. He resigned from active service on March 13, 1865 when he was appointed Major General for his meritorious service.

After the Civil War, President Andrew Johnson appointed General Asboth as Minister to Argentina and Paraguay. He was in Washington when he received the appointment in March 1866, signed by Secretary of State Seward. After a short sojourn in Paris where he tried to get the bullet removed from his face by Professor Nelaton who had performed a similar operation on Garibaldi, he went to London in August and embarked for Rio de Janeiro. After a stop in Montevideo, an American warship took him to Buenos Aires on October 14, 1866.

The ambassadorship of the General was made difficult by his pains and sickness. However, he became a close friend of the Argentine President, and rendered excellent service in the diplomatic negotiations in the war between Argentina and Paraguay.

As the Austro-Hungarian Compromise was concluded in 1867 and amnesty extended to all of the Kossuth officers, he hoped to return for a visit, but his hope was in vain. He died after months in bed and in pain on January 21, 1868, a little over a hundred years ago in Buenos Aires. He was buried with state honors, the Argentine President Sarmento delivering the eulogy at his funeral.

Such was the man whose memory we today

especially commemorate at the centenary of his death. A man of high courage, a splendid soldier and commander who coupled military discipline with humane treatment. A man of high ideals and integrity, a man of strong religious convictions in whose rooms the services were held for Hungarians while interned in Turkey. A man who gave his best, we can say his life and health, for his adopted country but who never forgot the ideals and values that he had received from the land where he had been born and educated. General Asboth remains a foremost example of the Hungarian immigrant to this country.

The Hungarian nation, too, has displayed the belief in the ideal of human freedom, dignity and national self-determination since 1848, most recently during the tragic, but glorious fight for freedom in the fall of 1956.

While we remember the struggles, the trials and the temporary defeats, we also remember the spirit that had motivated the actions of the generations who believed and fought for national and individual freedom in Hungary and in the United States. And may I close with the remarks that despite the tragedies of the past, the bleakness of the fate of the Hungarian nation at the present, the spirit of March 1848 and the heroism of 1956 cannot remain without results and that the Hungarian determination to lead a life of human dignity and national honor will ultimately be victorious against the forces which now, just as between 1849-1967 have conspired to obstruct its progress and victory.

Job Corps: Hospital Career Days

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, there is a critical manpower shortage in our Nation's hospitals. To meet this need and to utilize untapped manpower resources among the poor, Jay Wells, president of Wells Television, Inc., and a member of the Business Leaders Advisory Council of the antipoverty program, initiated a pilot program of considerable interest, Career Day, in which graduates of the Job Corps and hospital representatives met for job interviews. Working in close cooperation with him in this endeavor was William K. Klein, president of the Greater New York Hospital Association.

The Career Day, held in New York City, saw 60 eager young men, ready to graduate from the Job Corps in Camp Kilmer, N.J., meet with personnel directors and administrators of 33 New York hospitals in an all-day session. At least one job was offered to almost every one of the Job Corps graduates interviewed. A typical reaction of the interviewers to the clean-cut, well-dressed group was that of Helene Doneson, of the New York University Medical Center, who said:

I am impressed with the Job Corps trainees. I haven't seen applicants like this in a long time, and I've found them an excellent source of recruitment for jobs that have a career potential at the hospital.

Career Day and the opportunity which it represents is a significant step toward attaining the goals of employment,

achievement, and responsibility for America's youth. The entire community stands to gain a great deal from the full fruition of this program.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extension of Remarks the New York Times article describing Hospital Career Days.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SIXTY IN JOB CORPS ARE INTERVIEWED—CITY HOSPITALS OFFER WORK TO 47 OF THE TRAINEES

(By Val Adams)

Sixty young men who soon will graduate from the Kilmer Job Corps Training Center in Edison, N.J., were interviewed for hospital jobs here yesterday by members of the Great New York Hospital Association.

Forty-seven received at least one job offer from the 33 hospitals seeking to fill openings and the remainder of the men were said to have good prospects for jobs.

"All the men will be employed," said Jay Wells, a New York business executive who helped organize the interview session. "This is the first of a series of hiring days which will take place in various eastern and mid-western cities for men and women Job Corps graduates."

Mr. Wells, president of Wells Television, Inc., is a member of the Business Leaders Advisory Council of the Federal antipoverty program. The council acts as an adviser to the Office of Economic Opportunity, which set up Job Corps training.

VARIOUS TRADES INVOLVED

Mr. Wells obtained the aid of William K. Klein, president of the hospital association, in arranging the all-day interview session in the Brotherhood-in-Action Building, 560 Seventh Avenue at 40th Street. The Job Corps trainees, all neatly dressed and wearing ties, had been trained either for electrical work, offset printing, painting, carpentry or as cook's helpers.

Among the successful applicants was Billy McDonald, 20 West 115th Street, who was arrested about a year ago for possession of marijuana. He said low grades in high school kept him from playing basketball and left him dejected, but that he had learned much in his six months in the Job Corps—"group living, how to budget my money and personal hygiene."

Now being trained in food service, Billy will graduate from the Job Corps in September. He was offered jobs by Lenox Hill and Flower-Fifth Avenue Hospitals, but said he had made no decision.

COOK'S HELPER HIRED

Joseph C. Mitchell, 19 years old, of New Iberia, La., said he had been hired as a cook's helper by New York State Hospital. He was first trained by the Job Corps in Arizona as a tractor driver but found the climate there too hot, he said, and transferred to the Kilmer center.

Helene Doneson, an interviewer for University Hospital, said she had hired Hector Adorno of the Bronx as a multilith operator. "I am much impressed with the Job Corps trainees," Miss Doneson said. "I haven't seen applicants like this in a long time."

Senator Robert F. Kennedy visited the interview session and went around the room shaking hands and congratulating the trainees. The Democrat of New York said:

"There is a great job potential in the manpower shortage which grips our nation's hospitals. Today's meeting, therefore, represents an important step toward what I hope will be a continuing partnership between the Job Corps and hospitals all over the country."

Keeping the Vietnam Issue on a Rational Level

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, as presidential year politics heats up, there is a need to maintain commonsense about major, decisive issues.

The Kansas City Star on March 15, 1968, carried an editorial which should guide us in the tumultuous months ahead. I include it in the Extensions of Remarks:

KEEPING THE VIETNAM ISSUE ON A RATIONAL LEVEL

With the fascinating hold of a cobra's weave, the Vietnam war almost hypnotically is drawing political attention early in the 1968 campaign. Criticism of U.S. policy in Southeast Asia has absorbed Sen. Eugene McCarthy from the outset of his bid to wrest the Democratic nomination from President Johnson. Richard M. Nixon, the Republican front-runner, has already promised that a "new leadership" would find a way out of the Pacific conflict. The Johnson administration, speaking through Vice-President Humphrey, quickly challenged Nixon to tell how he would end the war.

Thus the course of Campaign Year 1968 is beginning to concentrate on the most unpopular war in American history. No doubt Dick Nixon will have more—much more—to say about Vietnam. So will Nelson Rockefeller if and when he openly enters the lists as a Republican candidate. Lyndon Johnson will be heard from, too, for he must defend his administration's war policy and discourse on its peace-seeking efforts as well. But the President can choose his own time for such dissertations and it may not suit his strategy to discuss Vietnam at length early in the campaigning.

Sen. Robert F. Kennedy is reassessing his position on whether to run against President Johnson in part, he said, because of the administration's plan to hold to its present course in Vietnam.

The Republicans—Nixon, especially—may be driving for maximum vote yield from the initial Nixon pledge to "end the war and bring peace to the Pacific." The war-torn American public would like that, of course. The Republicans have the advantage of being able to offer a new team for peace initiatives. Still there will be demands from the electorate to hear exactly how a Republican President and secretary of state would handle the problem differently. It may not be good enough just to claim that "we could do the job better."

Appeasement is not the Vietnam answer for the United States. President Johnson is not an appeaser. Nor is anyone with a chance to become the Republican nominee. But both parties will be making pitches on trying to end the combat. Such talk will build up pressures and in turn demands for a way out—almost any way out. All along the enemy in Hanoi apparently has been counting on U.S. election results to dictate a peace settlement forced on Communist terms.

Thus an election-year debate on Vietnam could get out of hand and cause harm. The candidates of both parties have a responsibility to be as reasonable as possible in discussing the war. Only rational, unemotional discussion can avoid damage to the interest of the nation and the morale of its fighting men.

Other important issues—poverty, the racial

upheaval and defense of the dollar—will also have front-rank as campaign issues. But the struggle in Vietnam seems likely to be agonizing this nation next November as much as it is now. How responsibly it is dealt with in the quest for votes could well decide the outcome of the 1968 election—and even of the war itself.

The Uarkettes: Student Singers of the University of Arkansas

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a group of student singers at the University of Arkansas has received high recognition. They are the only singers from the United States scheduled to perform at the international convention of the Rotary Clubs meeting in Mexico City this May.

The group, known as the Uarkettes, has given performances in recent years in much of Western Europe and in many places in the United States. They make excellent ambassadors for our country and, I am sure, will give the 16,000 Rotarians from 66 countries at Mexico City a very good impression of the musical ability of our young people. Arkansas is certainly proud of them.

I ask unanimous consent that three press releases regarding the activities of the Uarkettes be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the press releases were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAYETTEVILLE, ARK., November 2, 1967.—Rotarians from all over the world will hear the University of Arkansas "Uarkettes" sing next spring during the Rotary International convention in Mexico City.

Prof. Kenneth Ballenger, director of the 19-voice student group, received an invitation from the program committee of the organization that has clubs in 66 countries.

The Uarkettes in recent years have toured Europe, under sponsorship of the United Service Organizations, to entertain American troops, and have also sung at many places in Arkansas and other states.

Ballenger has been told that the University of Arkansas singers are the only ones from the United States to be invited to perform at a grand assembly of some 16,000 Rotarians.

Several appearances will be made at convention meetings during May 12-16. The Uarkettes will also perform for the North American-Mexican Cultural Institute in Mexico City, and will also sing under auspices of the United States Embassy.

Members of this year's Uarkettes are Donna Axum, Penny Garrett, Julia Eddins, and George ("Pal") Owens of El Dorado; Brenda Dill, David Hallin, Sylvia Rose, Linda Thomas, Lorry Thomas, Ann Burleson, and Elizabeth Hallin of Fayetteville; Connie Gobel of Mount Ida; Randy Lee of Pine Bluff; Max Ryan of Springdale; Fredricka Silvey of Calico Rock; Carol Soule and Mary Henley of Tulsa, Okla.; David Wylie of Ruston, La.; and Linda Eubanks of Pensacola, Fla.

FAYETTEVILLE, ARK., February 8, 1968.—Fourteen performances in Arkansas and two adjoining states are on schedule for the University of Arkansas Uarkettes, a widely known student singing group that has entertained audiences at home and abroad.

Kenneth Ballenger, professor of music and director of the group, says the Uarkettes will be singing to raise funds for a trip to Mexico City in May. They've been invited to entertain some 16,000 Rotarians from 66 countries at the annual international convention in the Mexican capital, and will make other appearances while there.

Professor Ballenger says that the Uarkettes are the only singers from the United States invited to perform at the Rotary convention.

Concerts scheduled prior to the trip to Mexico are as follows:

Feb. 20, College of Ozarks, Clarksville; Feb. 21, Station KATV, Little Rock, the Bud Campbell Show; Feb. 21, Arkansas Arts Center, Little Rock; Feb. 22, Downtown Rotary Club, Little Rock; March 7, Ozark Cannery and Freezers convention, Fayetteville;

March 9, Mountain Home high school; March 15, Grove, Okla.; March 25, El Dorado, Ark., Rotary Club; April 6, UA Alumni club and Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City; April 20, Rotary district convention, Osage Beach, Mo.;

April 21, Rotary District convention, Muskogee, Okla.; April 27, benefit concert, UA auditorium, Fayetteville; May 4, Town Club, Fort Smith.

In recent years, the Uarkettes have toured western Europe, under the sponsorship of the United Service Organizations, to entertain American troops, and have sung in many places in the United States.

FAYETTEVILLE, ARK., February 15, 1968.—Four new voices have been added to the Uarkettes, internationally known singing group at the University of Arkansas directed by Professor Kenneth L. Ballenger.

The Uarkettes will begin a tour of 14 concerts on Feb. 20 that will take them to points in Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Missouri, and then during May 12-16 they'll perform in Mexico City.

Additions to the group announced by Professor Ballenger, after auditions in which 15 singers participated, are: Susan Bensberg, Camden; Jack Meyers, Fort Smith; Susan Kemper, Coleman, Texas; and Mark Stevenson, Wheaton, Ill.

They join the following Uarkettes: Donna Axum, Penny Garrett, Julia Eddins, and George Owens of El Dorado; Brenda Dill, David Hallin, Fayetteville; Connie Gobel, Mount Ida; Fredericka Silvey, Calico Rock; Mary Henley, Tulsa, Okla.; David Wylie, Ruston, La.; and Linda Eubanks, Pensacola, Fla.

Ballenger has led the group in performances at many places in the United States, as well as in Europe where the Uarkettes entertained American troops under sponsorship of the United States Organizations.

Their concerts during the next several weeks will help raise funds to pay their expenses to the Rotary International convention in Mexico City, where they'll sing before approximately 16,000 Rotarians from 66 countries. While in the Mexican capital they'll also entertain at the North American-Mexican Cultural Institute, at Mexico City High School, and at the United States Embassy.

Address by the Honorable Manuel F. Cohen, Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, there has been a rapid growth in the number of investors in the securities

market in recent years. Reports reflect a total of 24 million investors currently which represents an increase of 7 million since 1962.

Chairman Manuel F. Cohen, of the Securities and Exchange Commission, said recently that the average daily volume of trading on the New York Stock Exchange has grown from 3 million shares in 1962 to more than 10 million shares in 1967.

On a recent day, Chairman Cohen reported, the American Stock Exchange volume exceeded 10 million—as compared with a daily average of 2.8 million shares in 1966 and by 2.2 million in 1965.

In this connection, Chairman Cohen recently delivered an address before the 1968 Conference on Mutual Funds at Palm Springs, Calif., which I am including in the RECORD, because of its broad interest.

Excerpts from the address follow:

THE MUTUAL FUND

(An address by Hon. Manuel F. Cohen, Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, before the 1968 Conference on Mutual Funds, Palm Springs, Calif., March 1, 1968)

The basic idea of a "mutual" fund is deceptively simple. A large number of investors, each with a small amount of capital to invest, pool their capital so that it can be jointly invested on their behalf by a manager who will decide what investments to make and when to make them. The asset value of shares in the fund is normally calculated on the basis of the market value of the portfolio securities, usually twice a day. The fund stands ready to sell an unlimited number of its shares at asset value plus a sales charge which may be reduced for very substantial sales. Outstanding shares may be redeemed at approximately net assets value.

This appearance of simplicity—combined with substantial rewards to salesmen—account, at least in part, for the great increase in popularity of these funds over the past two decades. But you know and I know that "mutual" funds are not simple—that they are in fact an aspect of a very complicated business which is growing more complicated all the time. * * *

In fact, very little about these funds is simple. Even the method of computing the net asset value for the entering or departing shareholder is not as mechanical or as simple as it might first appear. * * * We have also received expressions of concern by investors about the different methods by which their interests in a fund can be terminated; the difference between redemption and repurchase, and the fact that they may receive different prices under these alternative procedures, is not always completely understandable to them.

A second area of complexity relates to the objectives of the fund. . . . Investment policies differ in basic, and sometimes more subtle, ways. Funds go by such designations as "income", "growth", and "balanced", but the prospectus description of investment policy—drawn so as to preserve maximum flexibility for the fund managers—often provides only a hazy idea of what specific mix of securities may be held from time to time. . . .

A third area of complexity is the legal structure of the fund. Many investors do not understand the complex interrelationships among the fund, the advisor, the underwriter, the custodian, the broker and the various supporting players. We continue to receive letters from investors asking us to explain the roles of the various persons or organizations listed in the prospectus. These relationships are not always easy to describe in terms that can be readily understood.

Closely related to the rather complicated legal structure is the complexity of the

charges and costs that are involved in the acquisition and maintenance of shares in such a fund. One part—the sales charge—is paid by the investor at the time of purchase. It is usually based on the amount of the purchase, and may vary depending upon the amount and manner of the purchase. Another part—the management fee—is levied against the fund periodically—usually quarterly—and is based ordinarily on the total size of the fund. The third major part—brokerage commissions—is charged against the fund every time portfolio securities are bought or sold for it—including the investment of the proceeds derived from the sale of fund shares—and is based on the commission rate structures of the various securities exchanges. Additional charges may be levied for custodian fees, insurance and other miscellaneous services at levels based on a variety of factors. About all that can be said concerning the charges borne by the funds, and indirectly by their investors, is that they are substantial; yet it is difficult for the average investor to compute them with any accuracy or even to determine how substantial they are in relation to the gain he has achieved or hopes to achieve from his investment, since some of the charges are reflected in changes in the net asset value of his shares while others are not. Also, because of the unique external management structure of most of these funds, the investor has great difficulty in measuring the managers' compensation against generally accepted community standards regarding the compensation of individual corporate managers.

This brief recitation of the salient characteristics of "mutual" funds raises a serious question whether the word "mutual" is appropriate in describing this investment medium. That term is usually reserved for a situation where costs and profits are shared equally by all participants in the enterprise.

It was clear to the Congress in 1940, as I believe it is clear today, that adequate protection of fund investors requires substantive controls in the promotion, management and sale of mutual funds. The regulatory scheme devised in 1940, when the industry was in its infancy, reached the grosser forms of abuses, such as embezzlement and the more obvious form of overreaching. It seems evident that it is now important to deal with more subtle abuses which may flow from overcharging and overreaching which traditional disclosure techniques are ineffective to reach.

One problem—or group of problems—that the Congress foresaw in 1940 was in the area of size. The hundredfold growth of investment companies in the past twenty-seven years has greatly magnified the problem of assuring a fair sharing of the economies of that growth in size between the fund managers and the shareholders they serve. The Commission as you know, has suggested the enactment of an explicit court-enforced standard of reasonableness to assure this fair sharing. We suggested this as an alternative to true "mutualization" which is implied by the name under which these funds are sold.

Thus far, I have been talking about the complexity of the traditional "mutual" fund. But more complicated "mutual" funds have been developed in recent years, as promoters have exercised their ingenuity to attract more and more investors to this medium.

Most of you are familiar with the so-called "swap funds" which enjoyed a great popularity a few short years ago. We now have mutual funds which invest in other mutual funds. These funds add another layer of uncertainty—and frequently another layer of costs. Others propose to engage in complex securities transactions which were formerly considered the exclusive province of individual traders—puts, calls, straddles, short selling, short term trading and similar techniques. These practices, their risks and other consequences are difficult to explain or to describe adequately to investors. They

also harbor potential dangers to investment companies, as the important vehicles they are for the allocation of public savings, and to our public market places for securities.

The fee structure has provided a real opportunity for the exercise of the ingenuity for which fund managers have established an enviable reputation. After all, that is where the money is, and despite the common use of the term "mutual," the principal reason these funds are created and sold is to make money for the people who sell, and those who manage or otherwise act for, them.

A current and developing fashion seems to be the performance fee. An appealing case can be made for the proposition that the man who does well for the fund he manages is entitled to extra compensation measured by the quality of his performance. But, apart from the problem of establishing appropriate yardsticks against which to measure performance, a difficult problem which has not yet been resolved, we must not overlook the dangers inherent in certain types of incentive fees which led the Congress in the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 to prohibit compensation for investment advisers based on a percentage of the gains achieved by their clients. These considerations are equally matters of concern in the investment company area today.

But it is in the area of sales compensation that the ingenuity of fund managers has had its greatest flowering. There are contests and other types of special incentives for dealers who sell a certain quota of the shares of a particular fund. Apart from the bias this introduces, and the manner in which it affects the dealer's or salesman's judgment in advising his customer, it is almost impossible to disclose the nature and amount of these incentives adequately and effectively.

I might say that in the course of our Congressional hearings last year, a fund dealer informed a Committee that he received extra compensation when he sold more than a certain amount of shares of a particular fund, and that this fact was fully disclosed in the prospectus. The Committee asked us afterwards whether this was the case. We advised that the general framework of the compensation scheme was disclosed in the prospectus—but that the scheme was so complicated it was extremely difficult for the ordinary investor to understand its general workings and impossible for him to determine how much extra compensation his dealer or salesman would receive for steering his investment into that fund rather than another. As all of you know, the Commission's staff has never hesitated to insist upon the most informative disclosure that can reasonably be achieved. While it is probably true that we have not exhausted all the possibilities, this incident emphasizes that disclosure has not proved to be the answer to these problems.

Of course, the most complex technique of all for compensating the dealer who sells fund shares involves the use of part of the commission dollars paid by the fund on portfolio transactions. Fund managers have developed a variety of ingenious devices to channel excess commission dollars to dealers who perform various services for the managers. In connection with recent proposals for change in the New York Stock Exchange commission structure, we published a proposed rule based on the proposition that fund managers have a duty to use these procedures to return the excess dollars to the fund—a practice, incidentally, which a number of large fund complexes initiated voluntarily some time ago.

In our release discussing these proposals, we described some of the existing practices and indicated that they raised serious questions under accepted concepts of fiduciary

responsibility. We do not believe, based on our present understanding of the situation, that disclosure of these practices is likely to benefit the average investor or to redress any grievances in this area, even assuming that he could understand from the prospectus description how the system worked, exactly how much compensation was being directed to dealers and salesmen generally, and to his dealer specifically, and how much of it constituted a charge against his interest in the fund. Paradoxically, disclosure may even lead a fund shareholder to believe that these practices raise no legal or ethical questions, since the disclosure is found in a document which, as the salesman advises his customer, has been filed with a government agency having certain responsibilities with respect to the practices of investment companies.

My cataloging of these complexities of mutual funds does not indicate any desire on my part to return to a simpler era in all the areas mentioned. I wish only to point out that we must have an adequate system of regulation to assure that unsophisticated investors are fairly treated and that public confidence, so essential to continued growth of our securities markets, is not impaired.

Resolution on Vietnam

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, as the leaders of our Government, as well as leaders throughout the world, search for an honorable solution to the conflict in Vietnam, the National Council of Churches once again comes forth to show the way by suggesting a course that can lead to an end to the holocaust.

I call upon all of my colleagues to give serious consideration to the resolution on Vietnam adopted by the NCC general board February 22, 1968, which reads as follows:

RESOLUTION ON VIETNAM

(Adopted by the NCC general board, February 22, 1968)

The General Board of the National Council of Churches makes the following observations concerning the situation in Vietnam.

Prime Minister Harold Wilson is reported to have stated in the House of Commons on February 13, 1968 concerning the prospect of negotiations: "There is a very narrow gap to be bridged now, very narrow indeed." On February 14, The New York Times reports: "Secretary General Thant believes that if the United States unconditionally stopped the bombing of North Vietnam for as long as about two weeks, Hanoi would begin meaningful negotiations." The General Board welcomes these statements and considers that at this time no possibility of a peaceful settlement should be left untested by our government.

Secretary General Thant is further reported as saying that there is "a not unhelpful prospect for negotiations despite bloody military developments of the last few weeks." In the light of this, we view with disquiet the statement attributed to President Johnson: "that the search for peace appeared to be exhausted and therefore the time for debate had come to an end while brave Americans made their stand in battle." The General Board believes that this is a time when hardening of attitudes should be avoided, when there should be continued examination of U.S. objectives and methods in Vietnam, and when the search for a negotiated peace should be intensified.

Recent military and political developments in Vietnam indicate that the fundamental issues remain, and indeed grow more acute. Pacification programs appear to be in disarray, and the effective loyalty of large elements of the South Vietnamese people to the Saigon government appears to be in grave question. The Americanization of the war appears to grow in serious measure. There are many statements calling for intensification of the U.S. military effort. Assurances by General Wheeler that atomic weapons will not be used at Khesahn lead us to welcome and support the reported statement of President Johnson that the use of nuclear weapons has at no time been considered or recommended. Whatever the provocation might be, we do not believe that nuclear weapons should be used in Vietnam. Indeed further intensification of the U.S. military effort whether by invasion of Laos or Cambodia or North Vietnam or by large increase of manpower or firepower appears to us to be futile, tending to the destruction rather than the attainment of U.S. objectives in Vietnam. Similarly we believe that a massive attack on Khesahn by Hanoi will produce a hardening of attitudes in the U.S.A. and we appeal to Hanoi for restraint. Further, we ask that Hanoi, instead of simply rejecting the "San Antonio formula," initiate in its own way the stabilization of the present confrontation in the South even as talks are in preparation or underway. Intensification of fighting by either side appears to us to be self-defeating.

Encouraged by world leaders and members of Congress who feel that an early negotiated peace is possible, we urge the President to take leadership now along the following lines:

(a) Hanoi has made repeated statements, the latest on February 8 by the Foreign Minister, that meaningful talks will take place once the bombing of the North stops. We believe that we should move beyond the "San Antonio formula." Recognizing the grave risks involved, we ask for immediate cessation of the bombing of the North, realizing that this step will provide a definite test of Hanoi's integrity which if successful will lead to negotiations.

(b) Simultaneously with the above, we ask for reference to the United Nations General Assembly or other international body, to the end that cease-fire arrangements and negotiations be facilitated.

(c) We believe that the U.S. should restate its willingness to negotiate with all major elements of the Vietnamese population including the National Liberation Front, and with all parties to the conflict. We believe also that the U.S. must recognize the necessity for flexibility in negotiations.

(d) We believe that it is necessary that the U.S. restate now with decisive clarity its willingness and determination to withdraw militarily from Vietnam at an early date once a peaceful settlement has been attained.

Federal Impacted Area Funds

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a very serious matter in regard to Public Law 874, the impacted area funds. I have been told by some of my constituents in the Second Congressional District of the State of Nebraska that a cutback in impacted area funding could lead to a curtailment in quality of education now being provided for the dependents of our servicemen, and that

this curtailment could undoubtedly have a serious impact on the morale of our fighting men in Vietnam.

As you are aware, the Senate has passed a version of H.R. 15399, with an amendment which fully funds the impacted areas program. Undoubtedly the House bill with the Senate amendment will be sent to a conference committee. I recommend your support for the Senate amendment which would restore the \$91 million needed so urgently by over 4,000 school districts in the United States to educate the children of Federal employees and servicemen.

The cutback of impacted area funds will have a serious impact on my district and on the entire State of Nebraska. The State of Nebraska was planning on receiving an estimated \$4.7 million in Public Law 874 funds in fiscal year 1968. The supplemental appropriations we passed will net only 80 percent of this amount, which will result in a loss of Federal funds to the schools in our State of around \$900,000.

Educators from my district tell me that a good number of schools will have no choice but to curtail their educational programs for the remainder of the school year to the degree that education in federally impacted school districts could be far inferior to the education being offered in the districts with fewer Federal employees.

I would consider it a tragedy and a national disgrace if our boys in Vietnam should begin to receive letters from home saying that their children are only going to school half days or are being forced to attend overcrowded classrooms.

There is another situation which has recently arisen in the State of Nebraska which indicates to me that the cutback in funds will have a statewide effect. The Nebraska Unicameral Legislature recently passed a State aid to education bill. Prior to the passage of this bill, the loss of Public Law 874 funds affected only federally impacted school districts.

As the State aid bill is presently written, any loss of Public Law 874 funds by any Nebraska school district will have to be replaced by the State. I feel that funding of impacted area school districts belongs in the category of priority programs which should not be reduced. This program recognizes the inequity of asking local taxpayers to pay the expanded cost of educating a sudden influx of new pupils as a result of expanded Federal activities in local school districts especially in the case of military personnel.

The benefits of these Federal programs are nationwide especially in the area of our national defense, and I feel that the burden of educating the children of our servicemen should be nationwide, too.

International Education Without Federal Appropriations

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, a great many words have been written and

spoken on the subject of international education.

In questioning the wisdom of the International Education Act passed by the Congress last session, I sought to emphasize the need for additional activities by American educators abroad so that increased numbers of Americans might learn about the people, cultures, and languages of these nations.

A most valuable program has been initiated by a few American universities which have undertaken to send faculty members, administrators, and students abroad to help the educational programs of less developed areas. One such example is the program undertaken in Indonesia by a university in Iowa. The March 6 issue of the Christian Science Monitor comments favorably upon this activity in its editorial page.

As noted in this editorial, the valuable exchange of ideas and knowledge can be accomplished without huge congressional appropriations and serves the dual purpose of educating both Americans and Indonesians, and promoting good will and understanding between the people of the respective nations.

I call this editorial and the activities which it praises to the attention of my colleagues and Americans everywhere:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Mar. 6, 1968]

IOWA IN INDONESIA

A form of foreign aid that would not call for big congressional appropriations has been largely overlooked. It is college-to-college assistance.

A correspondent of this newspaper, visiting Indonesia, was made keenly aware of the need for such aid in that developing country. She found many capable young people clamoring for entrance to universities. But the universities were able to let only a tiny percentage of applicants in because they lacked the faculty and facilities to handle numbers.

This is a sad situation in a country where a greatly increased supply of educated personnel—professionals and technicians—is required to pull it up out of poverty.

Something can be done about it. A few of the large universities in the United States point the way. They provide for exchange of students, faculty members, and administrators with the Indonesian institutions. Sometimes the American universities send also much-needed books and laboratory equipment.

But their most important contribution is the assistance offered by exchange personnel. For most of them bring with them a knowledge of American methods of handling mass enrollments that can be shared with Indonesia. The exchange of ideas is stimulating to both.

Up to now the American universities which have established contacts with Indonesian universities are very few—not half a dozen. And the need is enormous.

More could be enlisted. In the United States are several hundred teacher-training colleges, and many universities with schools of education. All could benefit by establishing relationship with a similar institution in a country in need of help.

It would bring warmth and color to a prairie state college, for example, to have a sister college in an island nation like Indonesia halfway around the world. So would the presence on the American campus of an Indonesian exchange professor and Indonesian students. Gifts of books and materials for Indonesian students probably would follow naturally.

Everyone would stand to gain by such activity. If it works in Indonesia, it could be

expanded to include many other lands where educational opportunity is in short supply. An enthusiastic promoter of the educational foreign aid idea is needed.

Kiwanis of New York City Hear Stringfellow on Edison

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Kiwanis Club of New York City, which meets in my district with my constituent Edward Perlstein officiating, had the good fortune recently to have its member and former president, Mr. George E. Stringfellow, an associate of the late Thomas Alva Edison, speak about his work.

The address will, I am sure, be of great interest to my colleagues:

THOMAS ALVA EDISON, HUMANITY'S FRIEND

(An address by George E. Stringfellow, business associate of the late Thomas Alva Edison, delivered before the Kiwanis Club of New York City, February 14, 1968)

Thomas Alva Edison, father of the electric light and power industry, produced more inventions than any other man in the history of the world and was one of mankind's greatest benefactors. He was born in Milan, Ohio, on February 11, 1847—121 years ago. He died in West Orange, New Jersey, on October 18, 1931.

It was my high honor to have been selected by Mr. Edison to assume the management of one of his largest and most lucrative businesses. Any success I may have had in commerce or civic affairs, is largely the result of my daily association with this great American during the last decade of his long and productive life.

Embellishments can not fittingly pay tribute to one so humble, so plain and retiring.

He was passionately fond of work.

He was a genius in applying organized knowledge.

He was infinitely patient and undaunted in failures.

He brought forth inventions which broadened the lives of mankind.

He knew no class distinction; no national boundaries; no allegiance to any definite group—either political, religious or fraternal. His was the vision of the masses.

He brought amusement, joy and romance to man, woman and child. He lessened their labors. He widened their education for a fuller enjoyment of their daily lives. Great industries with employment of many millions followed in the wake of his discoveries. We can truthfully say there came from his laboratory, a supreme gift—a higher standard of life and higher living standards for the world.

At the time of Edison's death it was suggested that as a tribute to him, the electric power of the nation be turned off for one minute. It was felt this token of respect would cause the people to realize Edison's magnificent contribution.

Upon further consideration it was realized that somewhere in the bowels of the earth, men digging in tunnels and mining ore are dependent on electrically-driven pumps for air. Without it they would soon perish. In hospitals surgeons in the midst of operations with life hanging in the balance, are dependent on electricity to complete their work. The telephone and the police and fire alarms

are dependent on electric power. And in hundreds of other situations there would be great danger to life and property if the power of the nation was turned off at the source, just for a minute, as a tribute to its creator.

And so, in our very inability to pay as complete a tribute to Edison as we wished, we found a new and higher tribute to him. Life depends on the light and energy he gave us.

Civilization has been built around his work. At twenty minutes past three o'clock, the morning of Sunday, October 18, 1931, Thomas Alva Edison closed a long life of unparalleled usefulness.

Mr. Edison's approach to death was a wonderful example of unperturbed courage. Its inevitableness was thoroughly understood and on no occasion did he manifest any apprehension of spirit. He dealt with his failing health as impersonally as he did with any research problem. Before he entered the drowsiness which turned into the final coma, Mr. Edison compared himself with an old machine past repair.

The entire world followed the illness and passing of Mr. Edison with interest and sympathy reserved only for its beloved great, which he was. Throughout the eleven weeks of his illness, his home in Llewellyn Park, West Orange, N.J., was a focal point of unusual solicitude. Many thousands of inquiries on Mr. Edison's condition came to the inventor's home and to members of his family. After the word of his passing had been flashed around the world, messages of condolence and tributes to his genius flowed into Llewellyn Park in unprecedented numbers.

Mrs. Edison, who had been his close companion over a period of 45 years, was constantly in attendance at her illustrious husband's bedside. She contributed everything possible to his comfort and peace of mind. She exhibited extraordinary courage and fortitude throughout the ordeal.

On October 19 and 20 Mr. Edison's body lay in state in the library of his West Orange laboratory. Except for the casket and the simple floral decoration, this room was left almost as he knew it, with its galleries lined with reference mementoes of his amazing life.

After Mr. Edison's employees and co-workers had taken their last look at all that remained of their "old chief", the gates obstructing the way to the laboratory were thrown open and the public allowed to pass through the library. Four abreast they waited in line and moved sadly through the room. Old men and women, shabbily dressed, and school children were in line. Limousines with liveried chauffeurs discharged passengers who took their places in line.

During the two days and nights that the body lay in state, it is estimated that more than 50,000 persons filed through to render a last act of reverence.

On Wednesday morning, October 21, Mr. Edison's body was carried to his home in preparation for the funeral rites and burial. The funeral service was extremely simple, in keeping with the taste and character of Mr. Edison. While the ceremony was private, more than 400 close friends were in attendance.

After the ceremony the body was carried to Rosedale Cemetery in Orange, N.J. which overlooks the hills and valleys among which he had spent the most productive years of his life. It was dusk when the last rites were being said, and autumn leaves drifted softly to the ground from the distant fringe of trees. President Hoover's wreath of magnolia leaves lay at the head of the grave. Electric lights flashed on in the distance while Mrs. Edison stood in silent contemplation before the flower-banked grave.

Only members of the family and a few intimate friends, including his old cronies, Harvey Firestone and Henry Ford, and their wives, attended the interment.

In commenting on Edison's passing, the New York Times said:

"Edison, the light bearer, has gone into darkness. The master of the waves of sound is silent. Around him had gathered an atmosphere of respect, admiration and affection such as surrounded no other American of our time. . . . He might have wrought all these marvels and remained apart, solitarily in his laboratory. His companionable and social nature, his fine simplicity and boyishness, endeared the man, set up his essential human image in millions of minds. He was not only honored, but loved."

Three years before Edison passed on to his reward, a special Congressional Medal of Honor was given him for "development and application of inventions that revolutionized civilization in the last century."

Few men have received, or receiving, deserved such a compliment from the United States Congress.

The manner of his life became the manner of his death. Slowly, calmly, peacefully, he faced death. It found him as unafraid to meet the mysteries beyond as he had been unafraid to explore the mysteries here.

On his deathbed he said, "It is very beautiful over there." How true that must have been with his coming, and equally true it is that he made it very beautiful over here.

He ended his long life, not with a sudden stroke, but with a slow folding-up that seemed perfectly to suit it. No one can yet entirely estimate his place in history, but it can at least be said of Edison, as it was said of Lincoln, and can be said of very few others: "Now he belongs to the ages."

The Washington Post said of him:

"Few men will have the privilege of influencing the life and civilization of their fellow-beings after they have crossed the bridge of death, so much as this great American."

There are those who feel that Edison's greatest contribution to civilization is not listed in his more than 1,000 inventions and is not a material product of his laboratory. It is his inspiration to youth, his example to those who would dare to dream of new worlds, his challenge to accomplishment that will always spur onward those who fight the past with the future.

President Hoover said:

"It is given to few men of any age, nation or calling, to become the benefactor of all humanity. That distinction came abundantly to Thomas Alva Edison, whose death in his 85th year has ended a life of courage and achievement."

"By his own genius and effort he rose from a newsboy and telegrapher to the position of leadership among men. His life has been a constant stimulant to confidence that our institutions hold open the door of opportunity to those who would enter. He possessed a modesty, kindness, a staunchness of character rare among men."

Among the lessons from the life of Edison are his uniformly courageous and optimistic outlook, his triumph over his handicap of deafness and his consistent exemplification of the doctrine of self-help. In his achievements he reared for himself an enduring memorial.

Edison's last public utterance remains the best advice given to a perturbed world. It was:

"Be courageous. I have lived a long time. I have seen history repeat itself again and again. I have seen many depressions in business. Always America has come out stronger and more prosperous. Be as brave as your fathers before you. Have faith. Go forward."

Thomas Alva Edison was humanity's friend!

President Johnson Pays Tribute to Veterans of Foreign Wars

HON. JOE R. POOL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson paid tribute last week to one of America's most distinguished and important organizations—the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The VFW has been a strong right arm to many Commanders in Chief—including President Johnson. They have never wavered from supporting the President's efforts to provide for the security of America and the well-being of our fighting men.

They have recognized—in President Johnson's words—"that the greatness of a nation is measured by its willingness to fulfill its moral obligations to its own people, as well as to mankind."

Since the end of World War II four American Presidents have willingly accepted the new and costly obligations thrust upon the United States. The VFW has been in the forefront of those who recognize the folly of turning our backs on responsibility—and the enormous price of retreating into isolation.

Our goal in the world has always been peace—as it is in Vietnam today. But Americans—and President Johnson—recognize that peace cannot come to Vietnam—or to the world—when aggression, terror, and coercion are allowed to overrun the forces of freedom.

The VFW is helping to unite Americans behind this Nation's commitment to resist Communist aggression in Southeast Asia. Thus today, as in days past, the Veterans of Foreign Wars are—as President Johnson put it—a "voice of conscience and responsibility" for America.

Under unanimous consent I insert into the RECORD the President's remarks before the VFW dinner:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE VFW DINNER, SHERATON PARK HOTEL

Commander Scerra, Senator Russell, distinguished Members of Congress, Members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, ladies and gentlemen:

I came here to join you briefly this evening because it gave me a chance to share in the high honor that your great organization is paying to a champion of the American fighting man, a great friend of the American veteran, a leader for decades of all the people of this country, and I am very proud to say my long-time and good friend, Richard Russell of Georgia.

I would also like to take a moment now to pay tribute to another splendid Georgian—a great American—Dean Rusk. I do not believe ever in our history has this office been filled by a more dedicated or by a more sincere American. I have never heard United States policy and our commitments so eloquently stated—and under such very trying circumstances—than was done by Secretary Rusk in the last two days before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

If this Nation is secure—and if it is kept secure—all Americans will owe a great debt to these two great Georgians, Dick Russell and Dean Rusk.

I have always heard that the Veterans of Foreign Wars dinner attracts more Members of Congress than any other social event. As

I look around this room tonight, I can well believe that. I see many of my old-time friends from Capitol Hill here. I do still have some friends left up there.

Of course, many of my political friends are home tonight, watching TV. I am told that there is a special on tonight—from New Hampshire.

You know the New Hampshire primaries are unique in politics. They are the only races where anybody can run—and everybody can win.

I think New Hampshire is the only place where candidates can claim 20 percent as a landslide and 40 percent as a mandate and 60 percent as unanimous.

I had an early report from New Hampshire this morning on one of these unbiased television networks. They had counted 25 votes there. In the first 25, the vote for LBJ was zero. I said to Mrs. Johnson: "What do you think about that?" She answered: "I think the day is bound to get better, Lyndon."

Well, it has been a long day. I have not been home to dinner yet. But I am proud to come here and to bring to this great organization my message of gratitude. I want to thank you Commander and every member of this organization for all that you have done—for all that you are doing—for the security and well-being of the United States of America.

I want to thank you for the support that you gave our surtax proposal which would make fiscal responsibility possible and would give confidence to the rest of the world.

I want to thank you for your support when the debt ceiling had to be raised.

I want to thank you for joining me and helping me settle the railroad strike.

I want to thank you for endorsing the extension of the draft so we would not have to send our Army home.

I told Tiger Teague, my dear friend, Chairman of the Veterans Committee, coming in tonight: I want to thank you for backing every piece of legislation to aid our men in Vietnam when they come home and when they join you as Veterans of Foreign Wars.

I want all of those who hear me or read me to know that I believe that you are great spokesmen for the American veteran—for the man who has laid his life on the line for his country.

But you have also been a voice for responsibility in all world affairs. You have understood that duty always travels with strength—that the greatness of a nation is measured by its willingness to fulfill its moral obligations to its own people, as well as to mankind.

The United States, at the end of the Second World War, did not go out in search of new obligations. Our strength, and our commitment to man's freedom, brought those obligations to our door. Four Presidents now have recognized those obligations. 10 Congresses have verified them.

They have been costly—in blood and in treasure. The only higher cost would have come from our ignoring them or from our failure to assume them. The price of isolationism—

Whether it is the old-fashioned kind of isolationism that is rooted in ignorance, or the new-fashioned kind that grows from weariness and impatience,

Whatever its kind, isolationism exacts the highest price of all and, ultimately, as well learned, it is unpayable.

Our goal, my friends, is not the unlimited extension of American responsibilities anywhere. It is clearly not the conquest of a single foot of territory anywhere in the world. It is not the imposition of any form of government or economy on any other people on this earth.

Our goal is peace—the blessed condition that allows each nation to pursue its own purposes:

Free of marching invaders and aggressors;
Free of terror in the night;

Free of hunger, and ignorance, and crippling diseases.

If we take up arms, we take them up only to guard against those enemies. It is to help the nation builders. It is to try to shield the weak so that time can make them strong. It is to bar aggression. It is to build the lasting peace that is our country's single purpose today.

We send our young men abroad because peace is threatened in other lands tonight, and ultimately in our own.

We take our stand to give stability to a world where stability is needed desperately.

We rattle no sabers. We seek to intimidate no man.

But neither shall we be intimidated. And from American responsibilities—God willing—we shall never retreat. There is no safety in such a course. Neither reason nor honor nor good faith commends such a course.

You of the VFW have been the strong right arm of many Commanders in Chief, of many Presidents. You have been a voice of conscience and responsibility for many years for many millions of Americans. I ask only that you hold straight to that course. You will help to lead your nation and you will help to lead your world beyond danger to the peaceful day when free men know not fear, but when free men know fulfillment.

I will leave you now in that confident expectation.

But before I go, just let me close as I began—with a word about our great honored guest who strives daily to make this nation more secure, and also a word about a resident of his State in his early manhood—our great Secretary of State. There is something I would like to say about Dean Rusk. He is a good and a wise man. He has known the heat of the kitchen—as well as the television lights. The dignity that comes from the clay soil from which he sprang—he has known it long enough to know that good humor and great patience also play their part in history, too.

So, I will return home now to watch another television replay—the Dean Rusk Show.

That's the show, you know, that was two years in production. We had a great cast—but no plot.

We also had trouble picking the title. "Gunsmoke" had already been taken. We finally decided on "Shoot-Out at Capitol Hill."

Then we couldn't find a sponsor. They all said: "Sorry, quiz shows are dead."

I saw Secretary Rusk tonight before I came over here. He looked different. I said: "Where have you been?" And you know—for the first time in two complete days the Secretary of State did not have an answer.

But you men of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, who, in order to qualify for your membership, have had the answer.

You have Dick Russell's appreciation and Dean Rusk's gratitude and my thankfulness. Thank you so much.

Increase Our Gold Production

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, for years I have been in the forefront of those in this country who have seen a very serious problem developing as to our gold supplies.

Having reviewed carefully production and pricing figures over the years, I have always believed that we should increase the domestic production of gold in order

to have sufficient on hand to protect both our monetary and industrial demands if that could be at all possible.

To this end I have been sponsor of gold bills to provide for increased domestic production of gold without incurring any change in the overall price as it affects our monetary situation.

The events over the last few days have indicated to me, as well as to many of my colleagues, that I have been right. Were we to have heeded the warning that I and a good many of my colleagues pointed to, we would not today find ourselves in a shortage position with respect to our own gold supply.

I firmly believe that we are in an era where we may well see an embargo placed on gold, and a run occurring on what little gold supplies we have, even after the last desperate tack has been taken to remove the cover behind our own currency.

It seems to me that if France refuses to go along with protecting gold in international exchange we have no alternative but to increase our own output and at the same time provide our own citizens with the rights to procure gold and hold it in our own interest.

Again, I most urgently urge the passage of legislation to bring about increased production of domestic gold at a price adequate in the face of current costs to help delay the flight of gold from this country. And I am of the opinion that we may very well have to approve legislation sometime in the very near future to permit our own citizens to become on a par with other citizens in other countries in the world with respect to ownership of gold.

I commend to my colleagues and to those who have the interest of our financial future at heart to quickly and carefully review the needs of this country in respect to gold development and holdings.

Sputnik Now Spins in Liquid Space

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, we are aware that Russia has made, and is making, great strides in its efforts to bolster its seapower.

This fact should be of major concern to all of us. For this reason, I include in the RECORD the thoughts of Charles F. Duchein, national president, Navy League of the United States, on this subject.

Not only does Duchein bring this rising threat to our sea superiority to the forefront, but he also offers seven strategic safeguards to preserve American maritime supremacy.

The article follows:

[From Navy magazine, January 1968]

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE: SPUTNIK NOW SPINS IN LIQUID SPACE

(By Charles F. Duchein)

The Mediterranean, strategically significant since history began, now sports a brand new Communist center of maritime studies

and power. Today, the two super powers, the United States and the Soviet Union, are pitted face to face in this ancient sea.

One of the most sweeping strategic events of the 20th century is Russia's emergence as a Mediterranean maritime power. When elements of the Soviet Navy sailed out of the Black Sea into the "Med" under the cover of last June's Arab-Israeli war, the shock wave of Sputnik's first spin in space was lacking, but the implications were more ominous.

Elements of the 40-ship Soviet squadron, going far beyond the shadowing tactics of the Imperial Japanese Navy in the pre-war Pacific, brazenly joined the formations of the U.S. Sixth Fleet. They deliberately developed collision situations. While testing the nerves of our naval commanders, they photographed the Fleet and intercepted the ships' radio communications as part of an intense operational intelligence effort.

However spectacular, the Soviet penetration of the Mediterranean was but the first phase of an unfolding plan. Durable bases were needed next to sustain their presence and to serve as a springboard.

Conveying a protective paternalism toward their Arab allies, the Soviet warships put in to Alexandria and Port Said, in Egypt.

With a few flourishes and an ingratiating display of diplomacy and friendship, the Soviets were "in." With these bases assured, their sights were quickly trained on Mers el Kabir in Algeria. As the French firm up plans for withdrawal, 10 years in advance of the termination of their treaty, the modern Soviet missile ships made operational visits there. No time was lost in preparing for their westward advance toward Gibraltar.

Then, Soviet plans for a carrier construction program were revealed. Intelligence estimates indicated that their first carriers were for amphibious employment, quite possibly in the Indian Ocean. The assumption, based on their size, is that they will handle helicopters and carry the newly created Soviet Marine Corps. But they also might carry new high performance vertical take-off and landing (VTOL) aircraft.

On the heels of the carrier report came news that the ELATH, an Israeli destroyer, was sunk by Soviet-made missiles fired by an Egyptian patrol boat. ELATH was the first surface ship in history to be sunk by missiles.

This rapidly developing mosaic of Soviet maritime accomplishments was uppermost in my mind when we flew to Spain for our Navy League sectional meeting in November. Obviously, many pressing questions about the Soviet build-up remained to be answered; I looked forward with intense interest to discussing the maritime developments in depth with the U.S. naval leaders on the scene with first hand knowledge of this surge in Soviet sea power. They were frank in expressing their concern. The substance of Admiral Don Griffin's remarks to our group is recorded in the December 11 issue of *U.S. News & World Report*.

Their observations were diverse in detail but confirmed the crucial significance of the mounting maritime threat. They agreed that we are witnessing the start of a massive Soviet effort at global conquest via the oceans of the world.

Returning to the States impressed with the necessity for developing a naval program of comparable magnitude to that launched by the Vinson-Trammell legislation which established our Two-Ocean Navy, I realized the clear-cut responsibility of the Navy League's positive action. Broad maritime knowledge would be needed to gain support for a program of the magnitude required to maintain our control and command of the sea. The critical need was for a national maritime policy to meet the unprecedented oceanic challenge confronting the nation. Manifestly, the maritime educational purpose of the Navy League has never been more important than it is today.

Shortly after our return, the White House announced that the Secretary of Defense would step down after seven years of service. Changes in our strategy could be anticipated.

And so, these two factors, expanding Soviet pressure and the prospect of a new look at our national defense needs, led to the formulation of this program of seven strategic safeguards to preserve our maritime supremacy:

1. Establish an Indian Ocean Fleet Without Further Delay. The British withdrawal east of Suez has created a power vacuum that may be seized by the Soviets.

2. Build a U.S. Nuclear Navy By 1976 to Celebrate the National Bi-Centennial With a Truly Modern Fleet.

3. Launch a Major Long Range Ship Construction Program to Build Up the U.S. Merchant Marine to the Strongest and Most Modern in History to Regain a Competitive Posture at Sea; and to Modernize the U.S. Navy and Double Its Power.

4. Streamline the Defense Organization to insure that naval advice to the President, as provided for by the law, is adhered to and the maritime viewpoint gains "equal time" consideration.

5. Establish a Secretary of Maritime Affairs at the Cabinet Level. The President requires both maritime thinking and advice encompassing the entire spectrum of oceanic advancement.

6. Stress the Educational Importance of the Oceans on the College Campuses Throughout the Country. Regaining the posture and perspective to prevail in the world's maritime arena on into the 21st Century requires knowledge, understanding and intellectual interest in the oceans.

7. Reorient the National Strategy to a Predominantly Maritime Mobile Power Structure. The geography and power problems of our predominantly water world, coupled with the weaponry of mass destruction, place a premium on military mobility. A sea pressure strategy is required.

I am confident that with the adoption of these strategic safeguards the nation will move forward to its flourishing maritime destiny.

Baltic States Commemorative Stamp

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, on October 31, 1967, I introduced a bill (H.R. 13770) which would provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the independence of the Baltic States—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

Since the introduction of this legislation, I have received many resolutions and letters from interested ethnic groups, as well as civic and political organizations. Every one of these messages endorse the idea for such a stamp and urge that early action be taken by the Post Office Department to officially recognize these countries' fight for independence by the issuance of such a stamp.

The fight for justice is not confined to one certain group, a certain segment of our population, nor confined to an individual political party. For justice, each is united into a solid front and I am pleased to place into the RECORD a resolution which I have received from the Young Republican Club of Arlington, Va., which expresses the desire of that group

for the Post Office to act and issue such a commemorative stamp.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION

Be it resolved by the Young Republican Club of Arlington, Va.:

Whereas the year 1968 marks the fiftieth anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the three Baltic States—Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia; and

Whereas there exist historical, cultural, and family ties between the people of the Baltic States and the people of the United States; and

Whereas the occupation and subsequent annexation of the Baltic States by the Soviet Union is violative of both fundamental human rights and international law and has never been officially recognized by the United States and other nations of the free world; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has overwhelmingly expressed its deep concern for the plight of the Baltic States, therefore

The Young Republican Club of Arlington, Va., requests the United States Post Office Department to issue a commemorative stamp to call the attention of the free world to the fiftieth anniversary of the proclamation of independence of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia.

Adopted by the Young Republican Club of Arlington, Va., February 14, 1968.

CLAUDE H. SMITH, Jr.,

President.

Attest:

CAROLYN PERSINGER,

Recording Secretary.

Dual System in HEW Guidelines

HON. DAVID N. HENDERSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I have received from Mr. Peter Libassi a copy of his latest guidelines issued by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare setting out the manner in which he believes we are required to proceed in order to comply with title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Thus far in the enforcement and administration of this act, much has been said about a dual system. My observation is that the dual system means that in the 17 Southern and border States we must integrate the schools while the other 33 are not required to take any such action.

I place in the RECORD a copy of a letter I am today writing Mr. Libassi in this connection and when I receive his response to it, I shall afford it the same publicity.

The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D.C., March 18, 1968.

Mr. PETER LIBASSI,

Director, Office for Civil Rights, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LIBASSI: Thank you for sending me a copy of the new guidelines recently released by your office setting out the manner in which you propose to continue enforcement of what you understand to be the provisions of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

It is extremely gratifying to me that these particular guidelines recognize the fact that

ours is a nation of 50 states and not just 17 Southern and Border States.

For the record, I would like to pose a specific question:

Are you now saying that you are going to proceed to insist that ghetto schools in the other 33 states be brought completely up to the standards of the virtually all-white schools in nearby suburban areas or have the suburban schools face loss of federal funds, or are you going to arrive at the conclusion after issuing these latest guidelines and this latest news release that the ghetto schools are, for the most part, in separate central city administrative units, and that the virtually all-white suburban schools in the north are untouchable?

In other words, you are really going to launch an assault against the hypocrisy of the "neighborhood school" system in the north while insisting with an iron hand on total integration in the south, or is your latest plan and release just more of the same thing we have had in the past?

I am sincerely interested in a frank answer to this question, and will give your response the same publicity I am giving this letter.

Sincerely,

DAVID N. HENDERSON.

The Racket That Won't Go Away

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, this morning the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce began another round of hearings on legislation to control the critical problem of aircraft noise. I am an author of a bill in this field and it is my strong hope that the committee will take favorable and expeditious action on this proposal as I urged in my own testimony before the committee last November.

In the March 16 issue of Business Week is an article entitled "The Racket That Won't Go Away" which discusses the jet aircraft noise pollution problem. It is must reading for all who seek to avoid another long, ear-shattering summer.

TRANSPORTATION: THE RACKET THAT WON'T GO AWAY

(NOTE.—With jet flights increasing rapidly—there will be 400 jetports in a few years—jet noise increases, too. Quiet engines are a long way off, so the goal is a "tolerable" noise level.)

Hot weather is coming again and with it open windows, outdoor barbecuing, and the eardrum-shattering effects of jet airplanes.

Every year the aircraft noise problem gets worse. What was once merely a major nuisance has, with the vast increase in the number of jet flights, grown into a roaring calamity for millions of people living near airports. And unlike the threats of trouble from sonic boom when supersonic transports start flying, jet noise is a calamity that is here today.

Jet noise stops conversation dead; it keeps people awake at night; it terrifies children; it can damage buildings and can lower property values. Moreover, it will get a lot worse before it gets better. Nothing now in the works will make planes substantially quieter before the mid 1970's. By that time the number of takeoffs and landings will triple.

The problem is not confined to the big cities. New, short-range jets are bringing high decibel counts to an increasing num-

ber of smaller communities. Within a few years, jets will be operating out of more than 400 airports—more than double the number handling them today.

CATCHING IT

"A lot of people living around airports are going to catch plain hell," says the Federal Aviation Administration's noise abatement chief, Isaac H. Hoover.

So will the Federal Aviation Administration, though, if something isn't done about the noise problem. For congressmen whose constituents live near airports the pressure to take action is intense. There is also talk that Ralph Nader will make jet noise his next major crusade.

And yet, jet noise cannot simply be legislated away. A solution will cost billions of dollars, assuming that government, industry, and the long-suffering public can agree on the solution—which, so far, they have not.

WALKOUT

Early this month the nation's airport operators angrily resigned from the National Aviation Noise Abatement Council, an all-industry group, charging that they were being made the "scapegoat" for noise. They declared, in effect, that the airlines and aircraft manufacturers are more interested in producing and flying planes at low cost than they are in reducing noise. They recommended drastic measures, including junking present jet engines and replacing them with new, quieter ones available in a few years.

The airlines are strongly opposed. The cost of replacing engines today would amount to more than \$3-million a plane for the big, four-engine jets, they claim, or approximately half the original cost of the plane. Airlines and manufacturers want the stress put on making the area around airports "compatible"—soundproofing existing homes, banning new ones, limiting the area to industries or open space. Most of these measures, too, would be extremely costly.

THREE CHOICES

"There are, generally speaking, three methods of abating aircraft noise," says John R. Wiley, director of aviation for the Port of New York Authority, which operates New York City's commercial airports: "moving the noise away from people; moving the people away from the noise; and reducing the noise at its source—that is to say, the airplane."

So far, moving the noise away from people has been the method most extensively tried. Most major airports have preferential runways that lead airplanes over water or vacant land when weather permits. Many also direct pilots to throttle back after lifting off the runway, often while making a sharp, climbing turn.

New York Kennedy Airport is famous for these requirements. The Port Authority began worrying about jet noise as early as 1951. At that time it passed a resolution saying that no jet aircraft could land or take off at any of its air terminals without permission.

DECIBEL COUNT

After much study it further declared that this permission would be granted only if the takeoff noise was comparable to that of large, four-engine piston planes then in use. The measurement the authority arrived at is expressed in something called perceived noise decibels or PNdB, and the maximum allowable under Port Authority rules is 112 PNdB.

This sound level is a generally accepted maximum figure at many major airports even though, in the words of one U.S. government official, it renders the surrounding area "unfit for human habitation."

To stay within that limit at New York, pilots on big intercontinental jets, heavily laden with fuel, have been throttling back—or so they have been accused—as their plane passes over a Port Authority monitor several miles from where the takeoff roll started. While this avoids trouble from the Port Au-

thority, it means the jet hasn't gained the altitude it otherwise would have achieved. So when the pilot pours on the power after passing the "black box" he annoys a different group of residents farther away from the airport.

NEW REQUIREMENT

For planes with lighter loads, which don't have to struggle into the sky, there is a trend toward requiring jets to climb at steeper angles in order to reduce the area where the noise is bothersome. Such procedures have already been put into practice at Washington National Airport, and are to be required at other metropolitan airports beginning this summer. Although this means higher fuel consumption, airlines are cooperating voluntarily.

Other experiments are being carried out to try to devise controls sufficiently precise to permit planes to climb and descend even more steeply, at an angle of six degrees. The angle generally in use today is three degrees. Government officials hope that by this summer the program will be far enough along to let the airlines begin evaluating whether such changes would be acceptable from a safety standpoint. The sharper the descent, the more precisely a pilot must gauge his landing. But even if better controls are found to be feasible, they would have to await future aircraft. They could not be added onto today's planes.

UNPOPULAR

Generally speaking, the measures designed to take "noise away from the people" require operating procedures that are distinctly unpopular with the pilots because, pilots say, they reduce the margins of safety. For this reason they are unpopular with airlines and passengers, too, though there is an argument over how much safety is compromised.

But if moving noise from the people is unpopular with those in the sky, moving people away from the noise is unpopular with those on the ground.

Airports are centers of economic activity. Thousands of people work at the biggest ones, and they understandably want to live near their jobs. Additional thousands in service industries need to live near these people.

It is politically impossible to rezone the land around an airport for industrial and commercial use. No matter how loud the complaints from people living under the flight patterns, the residents still will not move en masse to quieter locations. What particularly galls airlines and pilots is to watch the land around a new airport fill up with houses, hospitals, churches, and schools.

FUTILE ATTEMPT

The new Dulles International Airport outside Washington, which is owned and operated by the federal government, has been involved in just this sort of problem. Officials tried to persuade Virginia's Fairfax County to zone land near the field against residential housing and to permit only soundproofed industries or businesses on it. But the county declined to do so.

"If more localities understood the difficulty of producing quieter planes," says an official of the Housing & Urban Affairs Dept., "they'd think more carefully about what they allow builders to put up near airports."

EXCEPTION

Only Los Angeles International Airport has taken the approach of removing people from the noise to any marked degree. It has bought up land and houses between the west end of its runways and the Pacific Ocean and has torn down the dwellings, at a total cost of \$20 million. But this hardly makes a dent in the problem.

One proposed solution has been to soundproof and air-condition houses in the worst noise zone, which would at least help indoor living. HUD estimates that to do that around just the three noisiest airports, Kennedy, Chicago's O'Hare, and Los Angeles International, would cost \$240-million. HUD has put

out a handbook showing how to soundproof a home at a cost of a few hundred dollars to a few thousand dollars, but there is no federal money to help do it.

HUD does have a policy of refusing federal mortgage money for construction of homes, or grants for water and sewage projects in areas where noise exceeds certain levels. But others have gone right ahead. Near Kennedy, new homes are still being sold by realtors with private financing.

The Port Authority even suspects that real estate salesmen have aircraft-type radios or make telephone calls to contacts in the tower to see which runway will be used on a particular day. They then presumably take customers out to see houses on a "quiet" day. They also reportedly tell would-be customers that "that runway over there is going to be abandoned soon." Somehow, the houses are sold.

If people won't be moved from the noise and if, according to Willey, "the end of the road has just about been reached" in the area of preferential runway systems and approach and departure procedures, then the only alternative is eliminating noise at the source.

This is a difficult problem, indeed. A truly "quiet" engine is at least eight years away.

The Administration's present objective is simply to reduce noise to at least a tolerable level in areas more than a mile from the runway—this, within a few years. Studies have shown that below 90 PNdb there are few complaints; between 90 and 105 there is a marked increase; above that, complaints rival the noise of the jets.

NOISE LIMIT

The priority goal for the Administration is passage of a key bill (whose Senate designation, incidentally, is S707). This bill, on which some hearings have already been held, would give the government authority to certify airplanes for noise performance just as it now does for safety. Planes would be permitted to fly only if they did not exceed 106-110 PNdb. Eventually, this limit would be worked down as technology permitted.

Engineers are working on several aspects of engine design to try to dampen the noise, which comes from two basic sources: air rushing out the rear of the engine, and the whine of the fan up front.

FINDING A FIX

For more immediate relief, commercial plane manufacturers are working under contract from the National Aeronautics & Space Administration on ways to line the nacelles of present-day engines with sound-absorbing fiber. And sometime in 1969, a plane will be equipped and flown with modified engines for tests of operating efficiency. NASA has "reasonable hopes" that this plane can cut noise by as much as 10 PNdb. However, the potential cost is still unknown.

Even with such modification, present engines would continue to be abusively noisy. Therefore, unless existing engines are replaced by entirely new ones, today's planes will continue pouring out a high-decibel bombardment.

Graves Well Drilling Booms With SBA Help

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, America started as a small business—a joint stock company with shares sold to the public by the Virginia Company.

People may shake their heads today and say that the little man has no

place in our increasingly mechanized, technological society; the day of the individual, the small businessman, is past.

But here are the facts:

There are more than 5 million small businesses in our Nation today;

These businesses comprise 95 percent of all American businesses;

These small businesses employ four out of every 10 of our wage earners;

They provide family income for more than 75 million Americans.

Someone once wrote:

The greatest works are done by the ones.

The hundreds do not do much—the companies never; it is the units—the single individuals, that are the power and the might.

Individual effort is, after all, the grand thing.

This feeling is what made America a vigorous and prosperous nation.

The Small Business Administration was created in 1953 to help continue our American tradition of individual enterprise.

When necessary, SBA reviews and updates programs to meet new needs of the small business community. SBA Administrator Robert C. Moot consults with small businessmen and community leaders both individually and through local and national small business advisory councils to learn how the agency can be of more help to the community, urban or rural.

A good example of SBA's progressive attitude is the year-old program of arranging balanced economic growth conferences. These conferences, held in various cities around the country, have provided a forum which has proven to be of immense benefit to SBA, the small businessman, and his community.

Graves Well Drilling Co., of Sylacauga, Ala., will give you a good idea of the help SBA offers to businessmen in rural communities.

The company was started in 1946 by Louie Graves. In 1951 he took on a partner, but when the partner became disabled in 1959, Graves bought back his interest in the business.

Prior to 1959 the sales of the company were small because Graves Well Drilling performed mostly small jobs on a unit basis. Mr. Graves began to expand the business after purchasing his partner's interest, by broadening his territory and contracting for larger jobs. Sales in 1958 were about \$5,800. By the end of 1960 sales had grown to \$214,522 and the company had a net profit of \$11,672.

By December 1960, Graves had well-drilling equipment in 18 counties of Alabama and Georgia. The business was also engaged in the sales and service of pumps and water conditioning work. Because of the rapid expansion of his company Graves had to purchase a great deal of equipment needed to fulfill his contracts. The equipment was purchased on short-term financing requiring high monthly payments which consumed all of his working capital.

Lack of adequate financing put the business in a very difficult financial position. In the spring of 1961, Graves went to the Small Business Administration and applied for a loan. SBA made a direct loan of \$50,000 to him.

Through the assistance of the Small Business Administration, Graves Well Drilling Co. was able to pay its financial obligations and continue operating.

Graves' company provides a living for 10 families besides his own.

Net profits have increased to \$22,000.

Net worth is now \$51,500.

And the \$50,000 SBA loan was repaid in full December 2, 1967.

I think that is fine. And so does Louie Graves, who said he would have had difficulty in meeting business obligations and that the company would not have progressed so rapidly without SBA's help.

And what about the effect of this successful small business on the economy of Sylacauga, Ala.?

It does not sound very important to say that Mr. Graves' business supports 10 families as well as his own.

But Sylacauga is a town of about 12,000 people, with no large industrial payrolls. It is a farming area. Those jobs are important to Sylacauga.

The 10 families supported by Graves Well Drilling Co. think those jobs are important. Louie Graves thinks so. I think so. And, obviously, so does the Small Business Administration.

Tax Exemption on Industrial Revenue Bonds

HON. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY
OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most effective tools for industrial development, particularly useful in the State of Mississippi and throughout some 40 other States, will be taken from the many communities of these States if the Treasury Department carries out its announced intention to repeal the tax exemption on industrial revenue bonds.

I think it would be wise to consider the resolution passed by the Mississippi Agricultural and Industrial Board by unanimous vote at its meeting on March 14. The agricultural and industrial board is the administrator of Mississippi's industrial development program. I insert the resolution passed by the Mississippi Agricultural and Industrial Board in the RECORD at this point:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the State of Mississippi has since 1936 had an effective and beneficial program for the economic development of this State known as the "Balance Agriculture With Industry" plan, which program has been declared by the Legislature of the State of Mississippi to be essential and necessary, and that the present and prospective health, safety, morals, pursuit of happiness, right of gainful employment, and the general welfare of the citizens demand as a public purpose the development within Mississippi of commercial, industrial, agricultural, and manufacturing enterprises; and

Whereas the Mississippi Agricultural and Industrial Board has continued faith in and a vital concern for the "Balance Agriculture With Industry" program and the economic development of this State, and is desirous of doing everything necessary to further foster and promote the general welfare of

Mississippi and to meet its responsibilities under the laws of this State; and

Whereas this Board has been informed about and has inquired into the proposed regulations by the United States acting by and through the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Treasury Department, and the Internal Revenue Service, and on the basis of such inquiry feels that the proposed Rule 131 under the Securities Act of 1933, proposed Rule 3b-5 under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and the proposed regulation discussed in Internal Revenue Service Technical Information Release TIR-972, will have a clear and present detrimental effect on Mississippi's industrial development program and thus adversely affect the public interest as announced by the Legislature of the State of Mississippi.

Be it therefore resolved by the Mississippi Agricultural and Industrial Board that it opposes the proposed regulations set forth above; that it is the judgment of the Board that such proposed regulations, because of their adverse effect upon the economic development program and on the economy of this State, should be vigorously and firmly opposed by all means available to this Board; that the Director and staff of this Board be and they are hereby directed to continue to carefully follow any developments pertaining thereto, and to take such action as is necessary to protect the interests of this Board and the State of Mississippi as expressed in this resolution.

Be it therefore resolved that the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Treasury Department, the Internal Revenue Service, the entire Mississippi Congressional Delegation, all Members of the Mississippi Legislature, and the appropriate agencies of all the States interested in these matters be advised of this Board's position.

Rural Areas Development Program

HON. WALTER B. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, in June of 1961, the Department of Agriculture in response to congressional action initiated a rural areas development program directed toward the elimination of the low-income and underemployment problem in rural areas by stimulating economic growth and income opportunities.

From that time to the present, the Rural Electrification Administration, an agency of the USDA, has actively participated in the RAD program by cooperating with its electric and telephone borrowers to assist them in improving their local economic conditions. I would like to review briefly the remarkable history of that cooperation.

Through the rural areas development staff of REA, the agency's borrowers have received technical assistance and other help, including credit finding, in the formation of local development organizations and in planning local community projects.

During 1967, in my home State of North Carolina, 21 of these development projects were energetically supported by REA borrower systems. These 21 alone sparked 1,075 new jobs. From the beginning of the program in 1961 to the present time, 156 such undertakings have been launched in the Tarheel State. This

has meant that, in all, 8,656 jobs have thus been created in North Carolina's countryside.

In rural America, during the 1967 fiscal year, these rural electric and telephone systems entered upon or broadened 616 rural areas development projects, helping to create some 34,000 new employment opportunities. From the inauguration of this program, only 6½ years ago, to the present, 2,700 such community projects have sprung into being. These projects have occasioned a great number of jobs which today has climbed to some 216,000.

This clearly activates a very healthy economic and social cycle. These key undertakings stimulate the economy of their areas, thereby boosting REA borrowers' revenues, which in turn augment the capacity of the rural electric and telephone systems still more to carry out their area coverage and service requirements as well as community obligations.

Such coordinated enterprises, begun by local rural organizations and aided by REA borrowers, have exerted a profound and widespread impact in many rural regions across the Nation. By so participating in the growth of various projects in their communities, REA borrowers once again contribute in a significant way toward the solution of our current—and critical—rural-urban imbalance.

In reality, these rural electric and telephone systems are performing a valuable service to the entire Nation by developing rural job opportunities in what otherwise might be depressed areas; by providing electric and telephone service, so vital to rural needs; and by bringing to light the rural areas' grassroots benefits—open space, fresh air, and clean water.

The Congress acted wisely in establishing the RAD program and the USDA is to be commended upon its administration of this program.

Keep Industrial Development Bonds Tax Exempt

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, on March 6, 1968, the Treasury Department issued technical information release 972. TIR 972 announced that regulations would be formulated governing the tax status of interest on State and local industrial development bonds sold after March 15, 1968. In addition, TIR 972 stated that persons may contract for the sale of these bonds only until midnight March 15.

Mr. Speaker, this effort to gain revenue through the taxation of these bonds will force marginal companies and individual small businessmen to seek financing in regular commercial issues in a financial market that is already prohibitive. This ruling will not affect the giants of industry. They do not need this type of financing. They have the resources necessary to successfully compete for high-

cost financing to expand present facilities and build new ones.

This ruling is damaging to the little fellow in American business. Industrial development will be very seriously retarded in the small rural community without the help of these bonds. In many rural areas of America these industrial development bonds have provided small industries with their only access to vital funds. The tax incentives associated with these bonds have been the law of the land for 15 years. To remove these incentives is to hamper industrial development in those areas which most need it.

One would have thought that by now, looking back on the unprecedented economic growth this Nation has enjoyed under the Kennedy-Johnson administrations, that we would still believe in tax incentives to stimulate and foster sound economic growth. Now the Treasury Department wants to deny this fact.

This ruling by the Treasury Department is a misguided effort at fiscal responsibility. This ruling will raise no real revenue and it will plug no real tax loopholes. All it will do is discourage industrial development in rural America. In the long run, the Treasury Department will realize more revenue in the form of taxes on newly created profits and jobs than it can by taxing the bonds themselves.

I approve of the spirit of thrift motivating the Treasury in issuing this release. But I submit the executive is not the proper branch of government to effect this change and even were it to enjoy this power, such a change will be self-defeating and not in the long-range development interests of America.

Therefore, I offer today a joint resolution which, in effect, directs the Secretary of the Treasury to refrain from enforcing this new ruling. Discussion and decision on this matter is properly the domain of the Congress. My resolution writes no new law. It merely maintains the status quo until such times as the Congress decides for or against new legislation in the area of industrial development bonds.

Mr. Speaker, I urge speedy action on this resolution so that we may restore confidence to business, local government, and the bond market. I also urge speedy action to make clear to the executive branch that they had best leave tax policy where it belongs—in the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I include the text of the joint resolution at this point in the RECORD:

H.J. RES. 1179

Joint resolution to provide for the exclusion from gross income, under section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, of interest on industrial development bonds

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) until otherwise provided by law hereafter enacted, interest on obligations which are so-called industrial development bonds shall be excluded from gross income under section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 in accordance with—

(1) the regulations prescribed under such section by the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate, as in effect on March 13, 1968, and

(2) the principles set forth in Revenue

Ruling 54-106 (CB 1954-1, 28), Revenue Ruling 57-187 (CB 1957-1, 65), and Revenue Ruling 63-20 (CB 1963-1, 24).

(b) The Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate is authorized and directed to issue ruling letters with respect to so-called industrial development bonds in conformity with the provisions of subsection (a).

Report to the People of North Dakota's Second District

HON. THOMAS S. KLEPPE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of my report of March 19, 1968, to the people of North Dakota. It might be noted that since this was prepared, a two-price plan for gold has been adopted. Text of the newsletter follows:

	December 1960	December 1967	Percent change
Net public and private debt.....	\$890,200,000,000	\$1,430,000,000,000	+60.7
Total farm debt.....	\$26,200,000,000	\$49,900,000,000	+90.0
U.S. Government debt.....	\$290,400,000,000	\$345,200,000,000	+18.9
U.S. Government spending (annual).....	\$93,000,000,000	\$167,500,000,000	+80.1
Yearly interest on Federal debt.....	\$9,200,000,000	\$13,500,000,000	+46.0
Interest rates:			
AAA corporation bonds (percent).....	4.41	6.19	+40.4
High-grade municipal bonds (percent).....	3.73	4.49	+20.4
Taxable Federal bonds (percent).....	4.02	5.36	+33.3
3-month Treasury bills (percent).....	2.928	5.012	+71.2
Consumer price index (1957-59) (percent).....	100.0	118.2	+18.2
Foreign short-term dollar holdings.....	\$21,300,000,000	\$32,400,000,000	+52.1
Gold reserve.....	\$17,800,000,000	\$12,000,000,000	-32.6

¹ Fiscal year 1960.

² Fiscal year 1968.

Administration spokesmen continue to assure foreign countries and the people of the United States that the dollar will not be devalued nor will the price of gold be increased over the present \$35 per ounce level. Nevertheless, the dollar is being devalued steadily through inflation. Gold continues to move out of the United States because other countries mistrust our fiscal policies and apparently believe that a rise in the world price of gold is inevitable.

The United States is rapidly running out of options in the area of fiscal decision. It may not be ours to decide whether the dollar will be devalued or the price of gold increased.

STRICTLY FOR THE BIRDS

Not since the "four and twenty blackbirds" were baked in a pie has the species received so much attention as now. Rep. Durward Hall (R-Mo.) spots these two items in the President's "bare bones" budget: 1. A grant of \$50,400 to the University of Wisconsin to prepare "An Ecology of Blackbird Social Organization", and, 2. an \$11,200 grant to California Polytechnic College for a study of "Competition and Social Organization in Mixed Colonies of Blackbirds."

THAT GOLDEN SPIKE

May 10, 1969, will mark the 100th anniversary of the completion of America's first transcontinental railway which came into being with the juncture of the Union Pacific and the Central Pacific at Promontory, Utah. Someone has suggested it would be nice to place the famous golden spike on display there again—if we can borrow it back for a few days from General De Gaulle.

HOW I VOTED IN 1968

For increased benefits under the Railroad Retirement and Unemployment Insurance

SOME HARD FISCAL FACTS

The gravity of this Nation's growing financial crisis is without parallel in our history. It is getting worse by the day.

Public and private debts are skyrocketing. Interest rates are the highest in the memory of living men. Our international balance of payments position steadily worsens as more dollars go abroad and fewer return home. The U.S. gold reserve dwindles as more of our holdings move into the hands of the central bankers of Europe and private speculators. Federal expenditures continue to mount, with a record-breaking \$186.1 billion budget projected for the fiscal year beginning next July 1. A deficit of some \$20 billion is forecast for the current fiscal year. Escalating war costs and ballooning domestic outlays may bring a larger deficit in Fiscal 1969, even with a tax increase.

Most alarming of all is the fact that the Johnson Administration steadfastly refuses to take positive steps to halt and reverse this rush toward financial chaos. There seems to be no real concern, much less a sense of urgency, over what is happening to the country. Profligate spending and galloping inflation seem to be accepted as the normal way of life. I urge you to consider the following figures:

Acts. This vote was consistent with my earlier votes on Social Security and Veterans Pensions to provide those on fixed incomes a small but needed catch-up on inflation. (Passed). For an Amendment to the Truth-in-Lending Bill making loansharking a Federal offense. (Passed). For passage of the Truth-in-Lending Bill. (Passed). For recommitment of the Export-Import Bank Bill. (Defeated). When the motion to reduce the limitation on the outstanding loans, guarantees, and insurance by \$1 billion failed, I voted against passage. (Passed). Against the Fire-Research and Safety Act of 1967. (Passed). I voted against this bill because another costly study commission should be deferred during this period of national financial crisis. For recommitment of the bill removing the gold cover from our currency. (Rejected). When the recommitment motion failed, I then voted against passage of the bill. (Passed by only 199 to 190). I am fully aware that our currency does not, in fact, have gold backing. Passage of this bill simply puts off the inevitable—thorough and strict fiscal reforms by the Administration. For a recommitment motion of a bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act. After the recommitment was agreed to, and the authorization was cut from \$33 million for 3 years to \$20 million for 2 years, I voted for passage of the bill. For amendments to the National School Lunch Act strengthening and expanding food service program for children. (Passed).

BILLS INTRODUCED IN 1968

H.R. 14727—To require the Secretary of Agriculture to make advance payments to farmers participating in the 1968 and 1969 feed grain program. H. Res. 1086—To amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to cre-

ate a standing committee to be known as the Committee on Urban Affairs.

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

As a Member of the House Agriculture Committee and its Subcommittee on Grains and Livestock, I have attended extensive hearings on farm legislation since early January. The first major bill reported by the full Committee revises and updates for the first time in more than half a century our *Federal grain grading system*. One major benefit anticipated is substantial easing of the chronic boxcar shortage. This would come about through the permissive sampling and new sampling techniques which would decrease turn-around time for cars. The Subcommittee has before it a *poultry inspection bill* which would bring sanitary standards up to the levels achieved in the meat inspection bill enacted late last year. I believe this is in the best interests of both consumers and producers. The full Committee is holding hearings on extension of the *Food for Peace program* (P.L. 480). Through the years, this program has literally saved the lives of many hungry people abroad. It has built and expanded vast markets for U.S. farm products. I strongly support its continuance. I believe further efforts should be made, however, to utilize more effectively the foreign currencies we receive in exchange for wheat and other farm commodities. The full Committee is scheduled to begin hearings today on *basic farm legislation* to replace the present act which expires next year. I doubt that Congress will approve new legislation before 1969. Action on the *rural telephone bank bill*, which I supported in Committee last year, has been indefinitely postponed by the Rules Committee.

HIGHWAY AND SCHOOL FUNDS CUT

The President's freeze of some highway construction funds and his cut in aid to federally-impacted schools may be designed to twist the arms of Congressmen who oppose his 10% income tax surcharge and who voted for reductions in foreign aid and the "Great Society" programs. The Presidential cuts, of course, are in programs which have strong public support. Actually, the highway fund freeze saves not a penny. This is a trust fund, collected exclusively from highway users. By law, it can be spent only on highway projects. For North Dakota, it means that nearly \$1.5 million which was to be obligated in 1968 will be released and spent in the future. This is a serious inconvenience to the public and to highway program planners. It in no way reduces the federal budget. The reduction in impacted area school aid throws a further burden on taxpayers in cities adjacent to federal installations such as the big Minot Air Force Base. They must provide additional funds to educate the children of federal personnel stationed there. For Minot's public schools, the cut amounts to \$177,198. Certainly an Administration which can budget billions for foreign aid could find a few additional dollars for the education of American children, especially after such a commitment has been made.

ARMS FOR OUR MEN IN VIETNAM

Recently the news media carried a report I received from an Air Force Sergeant in Vietnam who said his group was not issued weapons even after they were under attack. I brought this to the attention of Air Force officials who have promised to investigate. I understand there has been a change in policy as a result and that weapons are now being issued to some Air Force personnel. One man with a son in Vietnam wrote me: "Why are we continuing to send more men to Vietnam when we have men there without rifles to protect themselves?" I am continuing to press for the answer.

LAKE OAHE

The Senate has passed House-approved legislation sponsored by myself and Rep. Ben Reifel (R-S.D.) to name the reservoir Lake Oahe. It awaits Presidential okay.

Need for a Reassessment of U. S. Foreign Aid Policy

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the February 19, 1968, issue of Barron's magazine contains a lead article entitled "Foreign Aid Has Done More Harm Than Good." The article raises some pointed questions about the value of U.S. foreign aid over the years and even states that in many cases such aid has done more harm than good.

A good example of the harm foreign aid can do is to be found in the agricultural sector. The Public Law 480 program—known also as food for freedom—may have seriously harmed the incentives for farmers in developing countries to increase agricultural productivity. By providing free food, the United States has made it possible for foreign governments to keep farm prices low, thus discouraging agricultural production. And, what is even more shocking, the food the United States sends is not even being sent for the purpose of feeding hungry people. The Director of AID to India, speaking informally in Congress the other day, asked for millions of tons of wheat for India, not to feed Indians but merely to rebuild buffer stocks that had been depleted over the past 2 years. The rebuilding of the buffer stocks, of course, insures that the Indian Government will be able to keep farm prices down and reduce agricultural incentive.

Another aspect of U.S. foreign aid policy as brought out in the article is the emphasis on large capital projects, even though they may absorb an excessive share of the recipient country's resources.

In general, it may well be that U.S. foreign aid has enabled foreign governments to avoid making the tough necessary decisions to put their own economic houses in order. For years, foreign aid has made it unnecessary for foreign governments to balance their budgets and reduce inflation.

With the gold crisis now upon the United States, the United States is being forced to take a hard look at its overall economic policies. In this reevaluation of our economic policy, we should reappraise the entire AID program to really determine its economic impact upon developing countries.

The article follows:

DEAD GIVEAWAY: FOREIGN AID HAS DONE MORE HARM THAN GOOD

In a recent interview in *Fortune* magazine, Paul Mellon, well-known financier and philanthropist, wistfully observed: "Giving large sums of money away . . . is a soul-searching problem. You can do as much damage as you may do good." His thought was echoed the other day by George D. Woods, outgoing president of the World Bank. "Some aid," Mr. Woods told the second United Nations Conference on Trade and Development in New Delhi, "has not only failed to be productive. By doing the wrong thing at the wrong time, by making the wrong use of the slender resources available, at times it may actually have retarded economic growth." Mr. Woods tactfully was not specific, but his statement at least makes it clear that in his own ex-

perience he has arrived at a conclusion which sharply differs from the general assumption that foreign economic aid somehow cannot fail to do good.

Soul-searching in this realm is long overdue. Ever since the publication of Professor William Graham Sumner's essay on Purposes and Consequences, few American scholars have doubted that the purposes of political action may differ sharply from its results. All political enterprise risks getting caught in what Professor Yale Brozen of the University of Chicago calls the Untruth of the Obvious, as formulated in Brozen's Law: "Most obviously true economic propositions are false."

So it has proven with foreign aid, which, more often than most Americans would believe, has done its recipients more harm than good. Let us begin our critique with the Marshall Plan. Since it involved all the governments of Western Europe, as well as that of the U.S., little effort at critical evaluation has been made. However, few students of economic history doubt that the plan's success remained in jeopardy until the beneficiary governments embraced policies patterned on what one may call the economics of the horse and buggy age, i.e., they balanced their budgets, stopped monetary inflation and encouraged free enterprise. In Germany, Dr. Ludwig Erhard pursued such policies against the advice of Walter Heller, who subsequently became chief economic adviser to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson. Full success of the Marshall Plan was assured only after Winston Churchill won the election of 1951, and, for 17 years, saved the pound from devaluation.

Prior to his ascendancy, however, his predecessors saddled Britain with a burden which has proved crushing to the present day. Assured of Marshall Plan subsidies, they decided not to transform into long-term obligations Britain's nominally short-term foreign debt: the so-called sterling balances. Lacking U.S. support, they could not have afforded such extravagance.

Moreover, under the Marshall Plan, the U.S. for the first time disclosed its inclination to favor socialism on a global scale. In the early post-war years, for example, the French proceeded to nationalize one industry after another—notably coal and electric power—and to launch grandiose national plans. The latter embraced such costly and abortive schemes as the effort to displace Ruhr coal by developing high-cost French coal mines, and to expand the steel industry of Lorraine, which now finds itself in the wrong place. In electricity, the planners pushed the development of water power resources, a massive and costly mistake from which the Electricite de France to the present day has failed to recover.

Whatever history books and politicians may say, then, the billions of dollars laid out under the Marshall Plan by no means have netted unmixed blessings. The same holds true of later U.S. programs, misleadingly known as Food for Freedom and Food for Peace. Thus, students of agriculture wonder whether the U.S., by giving away food, has not dulled the interest of foreign governments in raising the productivity of their own farms, or at least in not hamstringing their peasantry. Evidence on this score appears in the January Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, in which Theodore W. Schultz discusses the ailments of world agriculture. He argues that U.S. policies have contributed mightily to the failure of foreign countries to develop the productivity of their land.

Instead, with U.S. support, foreign governments have focused on industrialization as their primary job, relying on certain postulates of the New Economics, with its emphasis on crude quantitative measurements—X capital funds invested yielding a Y increase in Gross National Product. This line of thought has led to continuing neglect, if not exploitation, of the peasantry, even though in most poor countries, the bulk of the popu-

lation—i.e., the poor—lives on (and off) the land. In most developing countries exploitation has taken two principal forms: price control for farm products, which depressed rural incomes, and very high prices for such farm inputs as fertilizer, farm tools and pesticides.

Such discoveries by farm economists—Dr. Schultz by no means stands alone in his critique of U.S. foreign aid programs ("bitten by the industrialization bug," as he puts it)—have not changed official U.S. policies. Thus, Washington is shipping grain to India as Food for Freedom (not to feed hungry Indians but to get rid of an unwanted surplus) even though India's 1967-68 harvests are so large as to exceed available storage facilities. Dr. Schultz also points out that free wheat has done its share to cripple the development of farming in Chile. In Yugoslavia, it enabled Marshal Tito to maintain a farm policy which systematically exploited the peasants for the benefit of the cities. The peasants responded by reducing their output, adding to the "need" for U.S. wheat.

Still worse have been the effects of Food for Peace in Egypt, where it helped sustain Egypt's war for the conquest of Yemen. If you add up the value of U.S. wheat shipments to the United Arab Republic, you find that Washington has financed a bigger share of the cost of the Aswan Dam than the Soviet Union.

To be sure, when people talk of foreign aid, they rarely think of farm surplus disposal but rather of power plants, factories and the like. What could be wrong with such facilities? Earlier this year, Vice President Humphrey traveled through Africa. His first stop was in Abidjan, capital of the Ivory Coast, where he announced a \$36.5 million Export-Import Bank loan for a dam on the Bandama River (which altogether will cost \$100 million). The U.S. in this case is financing a project which the World Bank turned down.

The project involves a number of highly technical questions which I am not competent to discuss. However, I think I can look at its economics. The Ivory Coast probably is the most prosperous newly independent republic south of the Sahara. It has a capable—though scarcely democratic—government. Its population numbers five million. Merely on the basis of population, then, the Bandama River dam is equivalent to a \$4 billion project in the U.S. However, the national income of the Ivory Coast per capita is perhaps one-third that of the U.S.; hence Bandama is tantamount to a \$12 billion venture in the U.S., one that is disproportionately large and bound to absorb an excessive share of the Ivory Coast's resources.

Moreover, from experience—if somebody would heed it—one could know that such projects are beset with risks rarely foreseen at the outset. In 1950, the U.S. launched the so-called Helmand Valley Irrigation Project in Afghanistan with an Export-Import Bank loan of \$21.5 million. In 1954, it added a second loan of \$18.5 million. In the latter 'Fifties, the International Cooperation Administration took over both loans, of which Eximbank was glad to be rid. In 1956, two reporters wrote about the failure of the Helmand Valley Project as a "lesson in foreign aid policy"—i.e., what not to do. Nearly a decade later, Interior's Bureau of Reclamation reported to the Agency for International Development—the current successor of ICA—that the Helmand Valley project was still a flop. Contrary to the hopeful view that failure in Afghanistan might serve as a lesson, however, things have not worked out that way. It's a long way from Afghanistan to the Ivory Coast, and Eximbank's memory is short.

These are relatively minor instances where foreign aid has proven unhelpful, if not actually damaging, to those on the receiving end. There are more horrible examples. One is the Republic of Korea, into which the U.S. for many years poured billions of dollars

with the avowed purpose of making it "a showcase of democracy." For years, however, all the showcase demonstrated was the unmitigated evil of rampant inflation. Then, after a brief military dictatorship, Seoul decided to stabilize the currency. It did so in two ways: by balancing the budget, and by allowing interest rates to rise to levels which to most Westerners look outrageous. A rate of 2% a month currently is cheap in Korea.

The U.S. politician's first reaction is doubtless that such rates spell usury. In fact, small personal loans in the U.S. carry similar price tags, while throughout Eastern Asia, rates of the magnitude are prevalent in the villages. In allowing such high rates of interest, Korea merely followed the example of the National Government of China in Taiwan, which also coupled currency stabilization with permission to charge and pay very high interest rates.

What such rates really indicate is the disparity between savings, on the one hand, and the demand for funds on the other. Both Korea and Taiwan have enjoyed very rapid economic growth ever since confidence in their respective currencies was restored. Indeed, their growth rates far exceed those of any other Far Eastern country. As for Taiwan, it is currently listed with pride as one developing country that no longer needs U.S. economic aid.

Let us end this rapid survey of foreign economic aid in Asia with a few remarks on India. For diplomatic reasons, the U.S. and other donors have preferred to close their eyes to one of the greatest burdens carried by India's people: the huge population of sacred cows. It probably is no exaggeration to say that India's bovines have eaten as much food as the U.S. ever has dispatched to feed the people.

For at least 15 years, moreover, the donors of aid to India have behaved as if its Five Year Plans were also sacred cows. Except for the first, the plans were misconceived and led to a widespread waste of foreign and domestic resources. Moreover, in the guise of socialism, India's economic policies in effect enriched a relatively small clique of businessmen who received special favors. Large state-owned enterprises, nearly all of which are wallowing in red ink, were launched. Finally, owing to the federal character of the Indian Union, industrial projects were located all over the map, mostly on a scale too small to be efficient.

Huge dams were built to supply supposedly cheap power and irrigation water. However, investments to distribute the latter lagged, and the nation's dependence on water power proved destructive when, in two successive years, a drought depleted the reservoirs. Failure of the monsoon yielded the Indian famine of 1966 and 1967.

Wasteful military spending and excessive outlays for industrialization have resulted in continuous financial irresponsibility. For over a decade, New Delhi has been both unwilling and unable to stop printing paper money to meet its perennial budget deficits. Combined with the maintenance of interest rates far below the proper level, these financial practices have richly rewarded hoarding and speculation. New Delhi and the state capitals have, of course, tried to impose price ceilings on many industrial products and to ration food. None of them, however, has been able to prevent black markets from defying such dictates—often with the connivance of officialdom. Reality in India, therefore, increasingly has been at variance with what official statistics and reports show.

India's record thus indicates that foreign aid in effect enabled its authorities to do what they ought not to have done, and not to do what they ought to have done. On balance, the people of India have suffered, rather than benefited, from foreign aid.

The same largely holds true of U.S. aid in the Western Hemisphere, especially since it took the form of the Alliance for Progress.

In the guise of relieving poverty, Washington has sponsored not only the usual stress on industrialization but also a concept of continental integration which runs counter to the continent's interests. All of the southern republics have grown out of coastal settlements (landlocked Paraguay and Bolivia lost access to the coast in protracted bloody warfare). Now emphasis has been placed on continental integration across the thinly settled and often inhospitable interior. One high official, for instance, observed critically that it is cheaper to ship goods from Buenos Aires to Valparaiso by sea than overland. In the name of integration, huge costly road and water power projects, which never can pay for themselves, are being launched.

To finance such ventures, nearly all South American republics depend on both U.S. aid and money supplied by their printing presses. Hence, even a country as sound and solid as Peru finds itself caught in a serious inflationary spiral. A mere 10 years ago, South American countries considered balanced budgets and stable currencies achievements worthy of praise. Since 1961, contrarily, such feats are deemed unworthy of progressive government. Virtually all have been induced to "make no little plans."

The consequences are the usual ones. Financial insecurity induces capital flight: the methods of the Alliance for Progress thus have created an artificial scarcity of local funds. Here, too, foreign aid has done more harm than good.

From any realistic appraisal, it follows that past standards of the magnitude of foreign aid have no relevance to what needs to be done. Legislators who urge cutting the foreign aid budget year after year may just think that foreigners don't vote—as most commentators suggest. Some, however, also may realize that the record of foreign aid fails to justify piling billions on billions without critical appraisal.

Conventional appeals for "aid to the poor" simply ignore the dismal record of foreign aid. Mr. Paul Mellon's wisdom on the difficulty of "giving large sums of money away" has yet to be taken to heart.

Resolutions Adopted at the Meeting of Hungarian Freedom Fighters

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, in commemoration of the Hungarian freedom fighters of 1848 and 1956, Americans of Hungarian descent met on Sunday, March 17, in New York City and adopted the following resolutions which I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues:

RESOLUTIONS

We, Americans of Hungarian descent living in New York and vicinity, meeting in commemoration of the Hungarian freedom fight of 1848 at the Assembly Hall of the Hunter College in New York, solemnly reaffirm our faith in and allegiance to the Constitution and Government of the United States of America.

We also affirm our dedication to the cause of just and equitable peace based on the self-determination of nations, including the Hungarian, and on sovereign equality of states in international relations.

We abhor Communist aggression and subversion in any part of the world, including the Republic of South Viet Nam where our sons are fighting for freedom and self-determination of small nations;

We call the attention of the United States and other free nations to the fact that despite numerous United Nations resolutions between 1956-1962, Russian occupation troops are still in Hungary and our former homeland is deprived of national self-determination and political independence;

We note that while 1968 has been declared as the year of Human Rights, they are constantly and grievously abridged by the Communist Government of Hungary by the one-party dictatorship, hideous censorship, suppression of church activities and denying the people of the rights of free assembly and speech;

We note that the Soviet Union has not yet released all former prisoners of war, deportees and 1956 freedom fighters and call upon the Government of the U.S.S.R. to fulfill this legal and moral obligation during this Year of Human Rights;

We must protest the fact that despite open admission of the illegal methods of the show trials of the Rakosi era, the Communist Government fails to annul the illegal and unjust sentence against Cardinal Joseph Mindszenty and restore him to his archepiscopal see in Esztergom;

We note with sorrow and indignation that the 1957 law which has resulted in the legal murder of 1.3 million Hungarian fetuses is still in effect despite the protest of the Hungarians abroad and the realization of medical and social workers in Hungary of the genocidal consequences of this immoral legislation; and we demand its immediate abolition by the Communist Government of Hungary;

We criticize strongly the disastrous economic policies of the Communist Government of Hungary which resulted in unemployment under the new economic reforms and in the contracting of 50-100,000 Hungarian youth and students to East Germany; and demand policies which favor Hungarian consumers and exploit Hungarian raw materials;

We cannot forget that thousands of our former countrymen are still languishing in prison for political reasons despite the 1963 amnesty, many were arrested and sentenced under flimsy pretexts or dictatorial laws since;

On this day of commemoration of the Hungarian National Independence Day, we salute our valiant armed forces in Viet Nam, at home and other countries of the world; the officials of our Government who are burdened with the difficult task of fighting Communist aggression and yet maintain peace as much as possible. We protest in strongest terms against those who, under the guise of democratic dissent, unwittingly or consciously serve the cause of our enemies by sowing confusion, resistance and treason in our midst. May they recall that this course, if continued unchecked, can only lead to national disintegration and a takeover by Communists and fellow-travellers as it has done in Hungary in 1918-19.

May God bless these United States and our former homeland, Hungary.

No Halfway House Between Victory, Defeat in Vietnam

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the syndicated columnist, Joseph Alsop, has been consistent in his advocacy of the correctness of our current policy in Vietnam. Recently, in his usual clear-headed fashion, Mr. Alsop has once again discussed the Vietnam issue. I include a recent column of his which appeared in

the Washington Post in the Extensions of Remarks:

NO HALFWAY HOUSE BETWEEN VICTORY, DEFEAT IN VIETNAM

In the prevailing fog of gloom and uncertainty there are only two things that can be said with perfect certainty about the war in Vietnam. The first is bleakly simple.

There is in fact no comfortable, easy halfway house between defeat and victory.

No one who has studied North Vietnamese policy, labored to read the captured documents, and followed on the spot the development of Hanoi's war plans, tactics and strategy, believes for one moment that such a halfway house exists today, or will ever exist in the future. The well-intentioned people who offer theoretical blueprints for such halfway houses are as ignorant of the realities as the people who used to peddle the view that Josef Stalin was really a nice guy at heart.

The North Vietnamese leaders are men with a tenacity and courage that seem all the more admirable in the present climate in Washington. They are also men endowed with the most steely ruthlessness. In the month of February, they expended their troops at a rate of more than 10,000 men a week and in the week of March 2 to March 9, they were still expending troops so lavishly that their losses exceeded 6700 men—and this is without counting their wounded!

Take as their population base the 16,500,000 people of North Vietnam, plus the 5,000,000 plus-or-minus under V.C. control in the south. Make the appropriate conversion. You find that the Hanoi leaders are in fact accepting losses which, if accepted by the United States of America, would run from 60,000 to 100,000 men a week in killed-in-action alone.

They are accepting these quite unprecedented rates of loss—10 times as high as the average in the recent past—because they are going for broke—trying to win the war in a short time—because they know they cannot stand the strain of greatly prolonged war. And they are ready to make such appalling sacrifices because they want to get their grip on South Vietnam.

To get their grip on South Vietnam at cheaper cost, the Hanoi leaders might well accept one or another of the crazier halfway house solutions that have been proposed in this country. But if that is ever permitted to happen, Saigon will be ruled from Hanoi in a very short space of time.

All the millions of Vietnamese who have put their faith in the United States will then suffer cruelly for this misplaced faith. The U.S. will also have experienced its first defeat in war since this Republic was established. And that leads to the second certainty in the present situation, which is also bleak and simple.

Feeble, needless acceptance of defeat in Vietnam will poison American political life for a generation or more.

The circumstances that produced the terrible McCarthy-time were downright trivial, compared to the hideous circumstances that will confront this country after acceptance of defeat in Vietnam. The resulting outcry about "stabs-in-the-back," the search for scapegoats, the accusations of disloyalty and worse, can in truth be expected to make the McCarthy-time seem downright cozy in retrospect.

Considering how obvious this ought to be, one is all but driven to conclude that the American Left has gone collectively insane. As anyone should be able to see, there is already acute danger of the most frightening sort of a turn to the right in this country. The extreme postures of the Negro racists and the trouble in the cities are quite enough to provoke such a rightwards turn.

The President's riot commission was no more realistic, when it warned of the possibility of American apartheid. That risk, God knows, will be hard enough to circumvent, and that problem will be hard enough to solve, without the added poisons that are

sure to be engendered by the first defeat in war in American history. Add these other poisons to the present mix, and the American future hardly bears contemplation!

Without regard to the wisdom or unwisdom of past decisions, there is therefore only one safe course to take. That course is to make the needed effort to win the war. Winning does not mean crushing North Vietnam, and it does not demand the measures proposed by men like General Curtis LeMay. Winning means no more than forcing the Hanoi leaders to call home their troops, and to cease threatening their neighbors in Laos and South Vietnam.

As any rational man should be able to see from the loss rates and population figures cited above, the Hanoi leaders cannot imaginably sustain the kind of effort they are now making for a very long time. If you go for broke and fail, the failure leaves you broken. Hence there is nothing hopeless in the present situation; but because of the American advocates of defeat-at-any-price, there is profound danger for the American future.

President Johnson Stresses Importance of Continued Studies in Oceanography

HON. ALTON LENNON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, in his message March 8 on conservation, President Johnson once again stressed the importance of continued progress in the vital field of oceanography.

That thought was behind the action of the Congress, a year and a half ago, in passing the landmark Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1967.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Oceanography of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am naturally proud of the initiatives in oceanography taken by the Congress, especially the landmark Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1967. And I also congratulate the President on his leadership. He has repeatedly demonstrated his commitment to the peaceful uses of ocean research. In the state of the Union address on January 18, he said:

This year I shall propose that we launch with other nations an exploration of the ocean depths to tap its wealth and its energy and its abundance.

And now President Johnson has spelled out his intent in his forthright message to the Congress, entitled "To Renew a Nation." Even in this age of space, the President pointed out, the sea remains our greatest mystery. Yet modern science and technology give us the ability to use the ocean for many purposes, such as to develop and use its living and nonliving resources, and information on weather and climate. We can now place electronic buoys in deep water, leave them unattended, and then through space satellites and other means gather data for improved long-range forecasts.

The President said:

The benefits will be uncalculable—to farmers, to businessmen, to all travelers.

He has made a specific proposal that we begin development of improved ocean

buoys. And he urged the Congress to approve his request for \$5 million in the fiscal year 1969 Coast Guard budget for this program.

I am pleased to see the President take this strong stand, and I heartily endorse his plea. The marine science program is one of the best investments this Nation can make to secure the fullest benefits for succeeding generations.

I believe Congress will continue to wholeheartedly endorse and support this vital program.

Freedom Resolution for Lithuania and the Baltic Nations

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, at a mass meeting of Americans of Lithuanian birth or descent held in the city of Worcester, Mass., on February 18, 1968, a resolution was unanimously adopted to seek United Nations action in obtaining independence for Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

The resolution was forwarded to me by Mr. Pranas Stanelis, president and Mr. Joseph A. Starenas, secretary, of the Worcester, Mass., Council of Lithuanian Organizations. At this point I would like to include the resolution, and it follows:

RESOLUTION

On the occasion of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Restoration of Lithuania's independence we, the representatives of the Lithuanian ethnic community of Worcester, Massachusetts, have assembled here on Feb. 18, 1968 in the Lithuanian Naturalization Club, to commemorate Lithuania's Declaration of Independence proclaimed on Feb. 16, 1918, in Vilnius, whereby a sovereign Lithuanian State was restored which had antecedents in the Lithuanian Kingdom established in 1251;

To honor the memory of the generations of Lithuanian freedom fighters who fought in 1812, 1831, 1863, 1905, 1941 and the Partisan War of 1944-1952 to defend Lithuania's national aspirations and values against foreign oppressors;

To recall with pride the political, cultural, economic and social achievements of the Lithuanian Republic during the independence era of 1918-1940;

And to express our indignation over the interruption of Lithuania's sovereign function as a result of the military occupation of our homeland by the Soviet Union on June 15, 1940, as a result of which national traditions and values were trampled, the personal freedoms of the people were suppressed and hundreds of thousands of people were liquidated by the Soviet genocidal practices.

Gravely concerned with the present plight of Soviet-occupied Lithuania and animated by a spirit of solidarity we, representatives of the Lithuanian ethnic community of Worcester, Massachusetts,

Do hereby protest,

Soviet Russia's aggression and the following crimes perpetrated by the Soviets in occupied Lithuania;

1. Murder and deportations of more than 400,000 Lithuanian citizens to concentration camps in Siberia and other areas of Soviet Russia for slave labor;

2. Yearly systematic deportations, under various guises, of Lithuanian youths to forced labor in Soviet Russia and their un-

lawful conscription into the Soviet Russian army;

3. Colonization of Lithuania by importation of Russians, most of whom are communists or undesirables, who receive various privileges at the expense of the Lithuanian people;

4. Pauperization of the Lithuanian people, conversion of once free farmers into serfs on kolchozes and sovkhoses, as well as exploitation of workers;

5. Persecution of the faithful, restriction of religious practices, and closing of houses of worship; and

6. Distortion of Lithuanian culture by efforts to transform it into a Soviet-Russian culture and continuous denial of creative freedom.

We demand, that Soviet Russia immediately withdraw from Lithuania its armed forces, administrative apparatus, and the imported Communist "colons", letting the Lithuanian nation freely exercise its sovereign right to self-determination.

We request, the Government of the United States of America to raise the issue of Lithuania in the United Nations and in international conferences as well as to support our just requests for the condemnation of Soviet aggression against Lithuania and for the abolition of Soviet colonial rule in that country.

Revision Needed

HON. ROBERT V. DENNEY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation which will extend the maximum period for broadcasting licenses from 3 to 5 years.

H.R. 16057 will amend the Communication Act of 1934.

Commercial broadcasters spend hundreds of work hours preparing applications for renewal of their licenses every 3 years. Much of the information required is a duplication of information which had been furnished to the Federal Communication Commission only 3 years before. This bill would reduce that duplication which costs time and money to the broadcaster and at the same time reduce the administrative burden and cost on the FCC. If the term of the license were greater, this burden would be reduced proportionately.

The majority of broadcasters are consistently approved by the FCC. It is my opinion that this extension will allow the FCC more time to concentrate their attention on the minority that are known misusers of their licensed trust. Under present law each broadcaster in the United States must apply for renewal every 3 years. Those governmental agencies, such as police, forestry, and fire departments who use safety and special radio service licenses must apply every 5 years. It would seem only fair that those broadcasters who have demonstrated their responsibility should be accorded similar treatment.

Mr. Speaker, the present law is unrealistic and outmoded when applied to communication needs and the integrity of the broadcasting media. For that reason, it would be my hope that there will be early consideration of H.R. 16057 to

cut down on expenses of the Federal Government and provide equitable treatment to responsible broadcasters.

For Peace in Vietnam

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the tragic issue of the war in Vietnam is becoming daily a matter of increasing concern to our people. In that connection, I want to call the attention of our colleagues to the text of an address I delivered last week before the Men's Club of the Jewish Communal Center of Flatbush, dealing with problems of peace in Vietnam. The text follows:

FOR PEACE IN VIETNAM, NOW

I am deeply grateful for the privilege of joining with you this evening. Among other things, it gives me an opportunity to express my appreciation in person to those of you who supported me and voted for me in the recent election. By the same token, it also gives me an opportunity to express my gratitude to those of you who opposed my election and voted for my opponents.

In the final analysis, those who opposed me establish the standards and criteria against which my performance as a Congressman must be assessed. To satisfy those of you who voted for me, I need only to measure up to your expectations. To satisfy those who opposed me, I must exceed their expectations. That I shall try to do.

In the meantime, I do want to thank all of you . . . friend and critic alike. I must confess, however, that I would be much more comfortable if there were fewer critics.

As your representative in Congress, I intend to become involved in a host of national issues of critical concern to all of us, and I will direct my efforts and energies intensively to secure a negotiated peace in Vietnam. In that connection I have joined with a group of my colleagues, including, among others, Congressman Morris K. Udall of Arizona and New York Congressmen Jonathan Bingham, William Fitts Ryan, Herbert Tenzer, and Lester Wolf, in sponsoring a concurrent resolution which directs the appropriate committees of Congress to "immediately consider and report to their respective bodies their determination as to whether further Congressional action is desirable in respect to policies in Southeast Asia."

Testimony by Secretary Dean Rusk, during the past two days of public hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, makes it clear that the State Department will not veer from its desolate policy which has been productive of death, destruction, and waste of American resources, while keeping humanity at the brink of thermonuclear explosion. It is a policy which has brought to an end draft deferments to graduate students . . . a policy against which I am firmly opposed. I cannot see why a commitment made to these graduate students touches less upon the conscience of the American people than a commitment made to political leaders in Vietnam so long ago that those leaders have long since passed from the scene.

The policies enunciated by Secretary Rusk will drag 200,000 additional young American people into the quagmire of a Southeast Asian military venture, at the precise moment when all America wants nothing other than to bring the boys home.

It is becoming increasingly clear that the objective of a military victory in Vietnam is the pursuit of a vain mirage. Escalation of the war effort towards that objective can result only in higher levels of death and destruction, increasing draft quotas and further call-ups of reserves and National Guard units, with the consequent dislocation of the lives of our people and our economy. Escalation will exacerbate the conditions which give rise to racial violence, crime in our streets and increased narcotic addiction.

Escalation on our part will produce nothing but the same on the part of the enemy. Indeed, if there ever was doubt on that score, it was fully established by the total destruction of the City of Hue, as tragic a loss to Eastern culture as was the capture of Paris by the Nazis to Western culture.

There is a deepening sense of frustration and malaise spreading throughout our nation stemming directly from the Vietnam War. This growing concern has developed not so much from the serious losses we have suffered there since the lunar New Year, but from events which have occurred here.

Publication just a few weeks ago of excerpts of Defense Secretary Robert McNamara's testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee reveals in glaring nakedness how the compelling drift of events shapes the destiny of man. The events in the Tonkin Gulf in August of 1964 do not in my mind, nor in the minds of many Americans, persuasively establish, beyond a reasonable doubt, the destructive escalation to which it gave rise.

The testimony given by the Defense Secretary unfolds a tale of intrigue worthy of the narrative skills of an Ian Fleming but in no way justifies the commitment of our manpower and our resources to a peripheral engagement against Communism, while its principal proponents, the Soviet Union and Red China, are spared the sufferings and burdens of actual military involvement. That very circumstance does in fact establish the imperative necessity for a negotiated peace in Vietnam.

War frequently brings out the best in man, but there is also a Gresham's Law which operates—something in which the finest in man is destroyed by his meaner instincts. In Vietnam this has meant imprisonment for Buddhist monks, for intellectuals, for political opponents, for students and for others who do not subscribe to the proposition that war is inevitable nor bow to the idea that the fate of Vietnam rests in the hands of the military clique which rules over the South Vietnamese.

In Vietnam, it has meant the failure of the pacification program, widespread corruption among its military and political leaders, and so gross a distortion of values that a prostitute earns \$500 a week while a peasant barely earns \$500 a year.

Under the circumstances it is not surprising that we have been unable to inspire the will of the South Vietnamese to rally to their own defense or destroy the will of the Viet Cong to pursue their course of aggression.

Here in the United States, the bitter sense of frustration has produced demonstrations, draft-card burning, and voluntary exile by those unable to square their conscience with the call to service of their country. The circumstances of war have so divided our people that some high public officials have begun to equate dissent with treason—a trend which is destructive of the very roots of our democratic process.

In the full sweep of human history, it is almost a moment ago when the United States exercised its persuasive influence to convince U Thant to carry on as Secretary General of the United Nations, despite the deep frustrations which assailed him because of the continued war in Vietnam. This past weekend U Thant, after meeting with world leaders, asserted that peace negotiations will begin if we stop the bombing. In my judgment,

we must maintain our faith in U Thant's judgment and insistent efforts for an honorable peace. We have no alternative but to take him at his word. I urgently recommend that we stop the bombing and call upon U Thant to convene a special session of the United Nations Assembly, so that all the world can participate in this peace effort, since all the world is at stake. Such negotiations will certainly require the presence of all parties, including the National Liberation Front. It will also require patience, compromise and realistic face-saving.

There seems to be a deep-seated fear within the State Department against negotiations, because of a history of Communist duplicity, involving continued aggression covered by an umbrella of negotiation. It is, of course, a fact that our experience in negotiating a truce ending the Korean War points to that prospect.

On the other hand, it seems to me that too many people in high positions in both the State and Defense Departments are unduly afflicted with the Panmunjon syndrome.

Certainly establishment of a permanent peace in Korea has been difficult. But who is there in those Departments who would turn back the clock in Korea to resume the shooting war? Our experience in Korea proves that the road to peace is a rocky one and blessed are they who choose to walk upon it. It is indeed striking that South Korea has progressed, under difficult conditions, to the point where it has been able to send 50,000 men to fight side by side in Vietnam with American troops—more troops than any other nation has sent to Vietnam.

Indeed, if Panmunjon proves anything, it persuasively demonstrates the urgent need to start negotiations now—in the interests of uniting our Nation, in the interests of advancing programs to revitalize our domestic policies, in the interests of removing the shadows of another world war and in the interest of establishing universal peace and security.

The Rising Crime Rate

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a most important report written by Francis B. Looney, commissioner of police of Nassau County. His comments contained therein are worthy of serious consideration by all law-abiding citizens:

THE RISING CRIME RATE

(By Francis B. Looney, commissioner of police, Nassau County Police Department)

Much has been said about the continuous rise in the crime rate in recent years and particularly the definite surge in criminal activity during the year of 1967. National statistics indicate that during the first nine months of 1967, an increase of approximately 16 percent in major crimes was recorded in the United States. This increase in crime has not been peculiar to any one area of the country as we in Nassau County have experienced the same type of acceleration. The fact is that the problem exists and it must be dealt with intelligently and realistically and that is obviously the primary reason we are here today.

As in the case of all serious problems, in order to find a cure, the cause must first be determined if possible. It is very easy to say, as many have, that the answer lies solely with the law enforcement establishment and to combat crime we have to have more effective

police agencies—that we have to increase the size of our police departments—that we have to have better trained and educated police officers—and that we have to devise new and more sophisticated investigative techniques. No one would dispute the advantages that can be derived from an increase in police manpower, more capable personnel, and additional enforcement tools, but, I submit, that this alone is not the answer.

Here in Nassau County we pride ourselves on having one of the most progressive and best equipped police departments in the United States. Our department is the second largest police department in the State of New York and the seventh largest in the nation, with a personnel complement of 3,664, of which 2,793 are police officers serving a Police District population of approximately 1,200,000, which constitutes a ratio of 2.3 police officers per thousand of population. Our police personnel receive 547 hours of basic training and 80 hours of in-service training annually under a curriculum which is reputed to have given us one of the most extensive mandatory instructional programs conducted by any Police Department in the United States. In addition to mandatory training, 438 of our police officers are presently actively engaged in college level study, 300 of whom are attending our own tuition-free Police Science Degree Program, with the remainder enrolled in eleven other colleges and universities located in the immediate area. The Department also has made every possible attempt to stay abreast of and deal with conditions brought about by social changes and attitudes. These efforts are evidenced by the establishment of and expansion of the activities of our Community Relations Bureau, Narcotics Bureau and Youth Division. We sincerely feel that we have been diligent in our endeavors to anticipate and meet the need for broader and more sophisticated police services by providing the high level training essential for today's law enforcement officer and performing the specialized functions necessary to cope with varied community and crime problems. Nevertheless, the fact remains that despite our intensive efforts, crime has continued to increase in Nassau County as it has elsewhere.

Perhaps those concerned with the crime problem have been looking in the wrong direction; perhaps we all have been concentrating on only one facet of a large complex situation and have only been scratching the surface and that a long hard look at the overall mechanics of our entire criminal justice system is necessary. It may be that the solution does not rest solely with law enforcement. I am not suggesting that our police agencies cannot do more, that there is not a need for additional and improved police training, increased coordination between police agencies, better facilities and equipment, a furtherance of public support and cooperation in the law enforcement effort, greater emphasis on organized crime or Federal and State responsibility in providing positive guidance and financial support to all law enforcement. Instead, I am calling attention to the fact that crime prevention is as complex as the causes of crime and the apprehension and arrest of violators is but one step in the team effort necessary to deter and prevent the commission of crime. We in law enforcement have a responsibility and cannot and do not want to shunt our responsibility, but at the same time we do not feel that the remedy is strictly in our hands. Even if it were possible to apprehend every person who committed a crime, this alone would not serve to eliminate all criminal activity as there is no deterrent unless immediate and vigorous prosecution leading to a sure and fair adjudication, coupled with swift and firm punishment is also assured. Consequently, the scope of any review or survey must be widened to include the entire orbit of the criminal justice sys-

tem, the courts, the probation and parole services, as well as our correctional services.

A study of all arrest dispositions made in Nassau County during the years of 1964, 1965 and 1966 reveals that only 8 out of every 100 criminal defendants are ever imprisoned or sentenced to a correctional institution. Further, that of 2,241 felons arrested in 1964, only 115 or 5 percent were convicted on the original charge, while 51 percent were convicted of lesser or reduced charges. Of the same 2,241 persons arrested for felonies, only 394 or 17.5 percent received prison sentences, in spite of the fact that 757 or 34 percent were "recidivists" having previously been convicted of crimes. Of particular significance is the revelation that of the 757 recidivists, 335 received sentences of imprisonment which means that only 59, or approximately 4 percent of the remaining 1,484 felony defendants were sentenced to prison.

I feel that these statistics are most revealing and I cite them to support my contention that any efforts undertaken to stem the rise in crime cannot start and stop with the law enforcement function but must also be projected to include the entire spectrum from arrest to and through prosecution, trial, conviction, punishment, imprisonment and rehabilitation of the guilty lawbreaker. It is my firm belief and I submit that a concerted and meaningful effort on the part of the legislative, executive and judicial branches of all levels of government is needed as only a complete team effort can reduce the crime rate.

U.S. Veterans' Advisory Commission Renders Excellent Report

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I extend my sincere congratulations and gratitude to the members of the U.S. Veterans' Advisory Commission for the outstanding report they have submitted to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. The comprehensive recommendations that they have made as a result of their yearlong study of the entire veterans benefit program will be extremely helpful to the members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. The needs of the veterans as well as the capabilities of the American people to support the veterans programs have been taken into due consideration in their evaluations.

These outstanding Americans traveled throughout the Nation last year, interviewing hundreds of veterans leaders, individual veterans, and civil leaders as to their proposals for equitable veterans benefits and programs.

The Commission, appointed by Veterans' Administration Administrator William J. Driver, was the result of a directive from the President that such a study be made. Mr. Driver will, in turn, make recommendations to the President based on the report. I know that the recommendations will receive the earnest appraisal of the President and that it is possible we here in Congress may receive still another message from the President containing proposals gleaned from the Commission's studies.

There has been a need for many years for just such a study. Many of our programs for veterans have been in exist-

ence for many years, but we needed an appraisal—at the grassroots level—of how effective these programs are. In addition, today's veterans are faced with different problems, and there is no question but that new programs need to be instigated to fulfill this Nation's obligation to these men.

I commend the Commission for its outstanding work. Through their conscientious devotion to this task they have fulfilled a much-needed service to the Nation and to our veterans.

Federal Affairs Seminar

HON. W. S. (BILL) STUCKEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, each year the Jaycees of Georgia hold a Federal Affairs Seminar in Washington. This year it was my privilege to be the official host of our Jaycees for their annual seminar in the Nation's Capital.

Mr. Speaker, I consider the Jaycee organizations throughout the country are an action group, and they are fast becoming recognized as leaders in our communities across the country. Their approach to community problems is action oriented and that is why they have been labeled young men of action.

The emphasis today is on youth, and more and more young men are taking leadership positions in our States and our communities. And, the Jaycee organizations are preparing these young men to assume these positions of leadership.

The services which our Jaycees perform for our communities certainly make our communities better places to live.

Mr. Speaker, the Georgia Jaycees were the first Jaycee organization in the country to realize the importance of learning the workings of our National Government. It was not long before the idea of the Federal Affairs Seminar caught on in other States and now each year, thousands of Jaycees come to our Nation's Capital to view the workings of our Government firsthand.

This year's trip for the nearly 150 Jaycees from Georgia included a briefing at the Pentagon on Southeast Asia and a visit to the White House.

During the series of workshops, the young community leaders were addressed by Congressman GERALD FORD who is minority leader of the House of Representatives and by Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY, of New York.

They also had a discussion session with Bill Downs, the ABC news correspondent at the Pentagon and Maj. Gen. Herman Nickerson, Jr., USMC, Deputy Chief of State, and the members of the Georgia congressional delegation.

A tour of the Vietnam Embassy was part of the program, as well as a tour of the British Embassy.

In addition to a tour of Washington, the Jaycees were given a tour of the U.S. Capitol by the reading clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I was proud to be the host for the Jaycees of Georgia. To me,

their yearly seminars in Washington are another vital step in strengthening the two-way communion between the people back home and their Representatives in Congress.

The Real Meaning of Education

HON. JAMES F. BATTIN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, although I didn't have the privilege of attending this meeting, I have read the remarks by Dr. Benjamin C. Willis before the National Schools Committee for Economic Education. These remarks by a man who is dedicated to the free enterprise system and who knows well the benefits of that system should be passed on to all who will read them.

Reading through this speech I feel that Dr. Willis has something to say about the real meaning of education and I include at this point his remarks in the RECORD:

LET US NOT LOSE IT

(Remarks by Benjamin C. Willis before the 15th Annual Awards Meeting of the National Schools Committee for Economic Education, Atlantic City, N.J., February 19, 1968)

It is with profound respect and admiration that I salute the members of the National Schools Committee for Economic Education. My feeling grows from the conviction we share: that the teaching of sound economic principles as integral to the American way of life has never been more urgently needed than today in the midst of sweeping changes in our country.

The free enterprise system, lifeline of the economic well being of citizens, must be understood in its total import if we are to rear a responsible and productive citizenry in our schools. Grammar school is none too early to stress the vital relationship between the competitive economy and the individual's share in the overall well being of his country.

Retreat of the young from business as a career is based on the deeper and more significant problem of a new social climate arising, in which welfare rather than well being is the overriding rationale. There are other symptoms of growing import: breakdown of authority; loss of respect for institutions and their role in society; a sweeping socialism that masks itself as "humanity"; the wielding of power without judgment, analysis, or principle; near anarchy of students in dissent—many more. The personal effects are loss of initiative, an attitude of "something for nothing" and growing dependence upon government as the sole determiner of the future.

If we consider just one phase of a growing problem, we see downgrading of values and the first stages of loss of personal liberty.

I refer to training the young for competency as opposed to mere socialization or dependence. I strongly believe that the young who find their job niche, after preparation and understanding of the relation of work to their life happiness, discover not only their self-image but their place in society. This alone makes it mandatory that the young be given liberal education in the importance of career as it relates to the fabric of the community in which they live.

I speak of applicable education that can be translated into a given job, as well as the basic attitudes so important in relation to that job.

If the young are made to understand that they must give back—in time, talents, skills,

and leadership—what their country has given them through education, then we have taken the first big step in making their lives constructive and meaningful in society.

The dissenter, the welfare-bred, the ADC recipient, or the average American student who uses instruments of force to gain monetary benefits—grow largely from the ill-tended soil of sound American economic instruction. We must teach future citizens in our schools the importance of analyzing their actions and the link between their personal well-being and education that will help them better it.

Schoolchildren must learn early the rights of labor, management, and stockholder in the American free enterprise system. They must learn to exercise their dissenting privilege within the framework of American law and order. They must learn the inter-relationship of man and the economy—and the individual responsibility that comes with the privilege of being able to work and to thrive on their own merit in that society.

The essence of our system is contained in the right of any individual of any race or creed to become all he is capable of becoming. These rights extend to the worker, who is paid adequately for his skills and contributions to the job; to the employer who has a right to fair effort for monies paid; and to the stockholder who has the right to profit from what is earned.

In the American system, with education, a young man or woman may aspire. This is what is meant by the term "raising aspirations." . . . the knowledge that personal effort, determination, contribution, may result in profit—both monetary and personal.

Under this best of all possible systems every man is thus free to pursue the best life can give him, free to achieve, free to excel. This is democracy in action. We dare not let the young be misled into thinking that rights come without work, without responsibility, without commitment of self to the American dream.

If welfare programs have any basic commitment it must be toward the eventual loosening of dependency and the thrust to remove those receiving aid into productive work, for that is the nature of our way of life.

The apathy of some students and the opposite—rebellion in demand for "rights"—is often laid to a lack of challenge. We need to counter-challenge this claim. There is upon us the most revolutionary time in the history of man: in science, transportation, communication, scientific-research oriented businesses, teaching, law, medicine, technology. There are hundreds of new job titles unheard of but ten years ago. From the unknown reaches of outer space to the wonders of the ocean floor, there are countless challenges to young minds. We urgently need those who drive the buses, repair the machines, plan the highways, construct the physical settings of cities. The list is endless. There is a job for everyone who seeks it.

From where will these workers come?

It is axiomatic that government is fast becoming the nation's largest employer. The question of who will control the future education of children is of direct concern to those involved with the pursuit of earlier and more comprehensive economic training. It is estimated that by 1975 some 82 billion dollars will be spent by the federal government for education. Out of this expenditure will come control of mass programming that can, if not analyzed and checked, contribute to the dependency of man upon government. What is needed is true government—by the people. We must not lose our liberty, either to government or any monopoly that would squelch individualism.

It has been cited that we are living in an era of social protest which has become the modus operandi of the time. I do not believe this; yet there are uncomfortable warning signs that power without discretion, bargain-

ing without principle, vested-interest dissent without conscience, are making inroads in our schools across the land.

Our high demand is to teach and teach early the basic principles, goals, and premises of economics related to individual conscience to offset the influence of the something-for-nothing climate that is seeping into our country. This means that in the early grades, traditional values of what makes an economy work in a free society must be interpreted to the young. High school is too late; by that time there are too many pressures from without vying for the youngster's attention.

The National Schools Committee stands for real progress in the recognition of good curriculum practices to achieve this goal. Creation of curriculum guides along the lines of sound, economic principles alone would make NSC's efforts notable, but, and this is the most significant, NSC's fight to preserve the American system is going to make the important difference to young minds in an atmosphere of expediency.

What higher cause for the educator in America than to give more than lip service to the cause of democratic progress. Citizens who love this country and who treasure freedom have helped make it great.

Wholesale unemployment, illiteracy, welfare rolls, delinquency, anarchy in the streets—and the grave threat to the American cities' cohesiveness from such destructive influences—these are the foes of the American way of life as we have known it.

Our human resources are our most precious wealth in the true sense of that term. We must not sell young Americans short by failure to imbue them with the philosophy behind the making and sustaining—and heightening—of a free and productive, and opportunity-filled country.

I have said I was full of appreciation for the work of the National Schools Committee. I am, not only as an educator but as a citizen. The youth of America, in their searching, want and need to understand the forces that make a country progressive, that make a country productive, that make a country the seedbed for genius, for contribution, for leadership. NSC has heard the cry and is answering it with tangible, practical, workable means.

The situation with the young is not without irony, from youthful idealism we get the urge to fight for causes. Unfortunately not always thought-out causes. From the need to hero-worship we get all manner of contemporary heroes who espouse negations of the principles that made a country in which the right to dissent is assured. Further, from the real sincerity of thousands we must match in our efforts to educate them to the realities of living.

Can we not make constructive good flow from these instincts and needs of the young? Can we not guide them to know and understand and fight for the principles of freedom—rather than selling them short by too quickly judging their actions and by becoming discouraged in the face of their demand for change?

I think we can. I think we must.

It has been said that the good values in life are not made as exciting as disruption in society is dramatized through media. Yet where is a more exciting task for the young mind than the conquering of an environment that demands creativity, knowledge, practical application, devotion? Where is a more exciting task than the inspiration of the young mind to pour his energies and talents into the reshaping of society?

I have commented in the past that the external city is often the result of the internal values held by men. Does this not suggest to us that we need to internalize those principles of freedom, and choice, within the young before they can transfer these qualities to the society in later years?

It suggests to me that we must begin

early, in the very early grades, to inculcate the youngsters with ideals. What has been permissiveness must become defined goal; what has become abstraction must become concretization. This last relates to all education—which must become pertinent, usable, in modern times.

I might sum up by saying, as a noted social worker has stated so well, "Service is the rent we pay for the space we take up on earth."

We must help the young to know that to serve through using their education and talents and wisdom is their high calling, and we must do this in compelling, absolute terms, for our problems are compelling and absolute.

Business must not be sold to young Americans as a monster with only the profit motive to justify its existence. It must be interpreted to the young in the truly humanitarian terms that it represents. They must be made to understand that the use of human potential, the flux and flow of goods, the law of supply and demand, and the provision of jobs, money, and a standard of life, hinge on personal commitment and hard work. They must realize that all men can profit under the free enterprise system, each according to his ability, and that no agency or monopoly or system of government can give them freedom that they do not work to obtain and to treasure.

Self government implies the responsibility to be able to work to preserve it, or, put another way, true government is the collective will of the people expressing their individual capacity.

So let us look behind the threat of anarchy in the classroom, on the streets, in government machinery, to the underlying causes—and work to motivate students to take their rightful share in the shaping of society.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak with you, and let me leave you this thought in parting: "We should love our freedom—and defend it—or we must lose it. Let us not lose it."

Farm Policy

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, a farm delegation representing the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation is in Washington this week presenting its views on several critical problems in agriculture.

In addition to talking with Ohio Congressmen, the group met today with several of my colleagues on the Agriculture Committee. At this meeting we had the opportunity to hear from Mr. D. R. Stanfield, executive vice president of the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation, who spoke on farm policy.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I insert Mr. Stanfield's comments in the RECORD at this point in order that all Members of Congress might have an opportunity to learn of his views.

Mr. Stanfield's statement follows:

Our space-age technology has made it possible for fewer and fewer farmers to produce more and more for each consumer. The number of farm workers in 1967 was 5.0 million—about half the number 20 years earlier. At the turn of the century, one American farmer fed an average of seven other people. Today, one farmer feeds forty others.

Farmers as a group are efficient as producers, but have not shared adequately in

the economic growth of this country. Many programs, such as crop controls, demand expansion, land retirement, export subsidies, import controls, and others, have been tried with varying degrees of success.

We can understand why we have difficulty in dealing with the over-all farm program if we think first in terms of the commercial farmers who have a \$20,000 and over gross income, and those farmers who have a lesser amount. We can also think of the problem in terms of the high volume farmer and the low volume farmer.

Generally, the high volume farmer has adequate land, capital, and managerial resources. The low volume farmer may be lacking in one or all three of these important ingredients. Following is Table 1. (Percentage of cash receipts, government payments, and U.S. farms, 1966) which indicates that there are 527,000 farms in the \$20,000 and over category, and while they are only 16.2 percent of the total number of farms, they receive 68.3 percent of the cash receipts. This leaves only 31.7 percent of the cash receipts for the other 2,725,000 farms.

TABLE 1.—PERCENTAGE OF CASH RECEIPTS, GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS, AND U.S. FARMS, 1966

Value of sales	Number of farms (thousands)	Percent of—		
		Number of farms	Cash receipts	Government payments ¹
\$20,000 and over.....	527	16.2	68.3	44.7
\$10,000 to \$19,999.....	510	15.7	17.1	22.9
\$5,000 to \$9,999.....	446	13.7	7.9	14.9
\$2,500 to \$4,999.....	356	11.0	3.2	7.4
Less than \$2,500: ²				
Part time.....	820	25.2	1.7	5.6
Part retirement and abnormal.....	378	11.6	1.1	2.4
Other.....	215	6.6	0.7	2.1
Total.....	3,252	100.0	100.0	100.0

¹ 1965. Government payments are included in cash receipts.

² Data based on distributions in 1965.

Higher prices are little help to the low volume farmer because income from sales is low.¹ Employment off the farm offers the best prospect for better incomes to the low volume farmer. The older operators usually choose to stay and do the best they can. The younger operators face one of the most difficult of all questions—should they try to do what is required to make a success of farming, or should they turn to another way of earning a living? No matter how agriculture is structured, it still must adopt new technology, use more machinery, retire some land, and cut down sharply on the labor force if it is to be progressive and contribute to the development of the American economy.

If Congress will now approve H.R. 13541, the Agricultural Fair Practices Act, it would be a significant step towards giving farmers some additional strength in their bargaining efforts.

The Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 expires at the end of 1969. Ohio farmer always have favored the Conservation Reserve.

Studies have shown it achieving a greater reduction in production per dollar than any other plan that has been tried. The retiring of whole farms has benefits beyond being efficient. We also have retired many acres through a partial farm retirement plan.

In Ohio our farmers prefer the whole farmland retirement plan because of its efficiency and because it gives the farmer greater opportunity to manage his resources and adjust to a new way of making a living. We feel that our long-range program should move in this direction. However, we realize that it is better to have some land retirement under a partial farmland retirement program than none at all. It is contemplated that in 1968 we will have a total land retirement program, including the whole plus the partial retirement acres, of about 55 to 60 million acres, and the total acres harvested will have declined from 324 million acres in 1957 to about 301 million acres harvested in 1967. The following table shows cropland diversion under specified programs and cropland harvested.

TABLE 2.—CROPLAND DIVERSION UNDER SPECIFIED PROGRAMS AND CROPLAND HARVESTED

Year	Acreage reserve	Diverted acres under specified program					Cropland adjustment ¹	Total ²	Cropland harvested (total acres harvested)
		Conservation reserve ³	Feed grain	Wheat	Cotton	Cropland conversion			
1957.....	21.4	6.4						27.8	324
1958.....	17.2	9.9						27.1	324
1959.....		22.5						22.5	324
1960.....		28.7						28.7	324
1961.....		28.5	25.2					53.7	303
1962.....		25.8	28.2	10.7				64.7	295
1963.....		24.3	24.5	7.2		0.1		56.1	300
1964.....		17.4	32.4	5.1	0.5	.1		55.5	301
1965.....		14.0	34.8	7.2	1.0	.4		57.4	298
1966 ⁴		13.3	32.0	8.2	5.7	.4	2.0	60.6	295
1967.....		11.0	20.6		4.9	.6	4.0	41.1	301

Source: Data from USDA, 1966, p. 541; USDA, June 1967, table 3.

¹ Conservation reserve and cropland adjustment represent whole land retirement; other programs represent partial land retirement.

² Total diverted including acreage devoted to substitute crops.

³ Not required to be put in conserving uses.

⁴ Except for conservation reserve, represents enrolled acreage.

Along with an adequate whole farmland retirement program, plus a partial farmland retirement program, we will still need to encourage agricultural exports and better food diets at home. It is also assumed that

¹ (Volume x Price) — (Expenses) = Net Income.

greater national efforts will be made to provide the opportunity for more youth to enter college or trade and vocational schools, with particular emphasis directed at the rural youth and younger farmers. It is further assumed that educational and credit programs will be continued and improved to aid younger and middle-aged farmers who have

the capabilities to enlarge their farm unit and the initiation of programs to provide for early retirement for older farmers who are now trapped in agriculture on small units with little volume of output and who have few other alternatives.

It appears we have an agricultural plant geared to meet all our needs with around 50 to 55 million acres of land in retirement each year. This assumes that the land is of the same type that was retired during this period.

Tweeten of Oklahoma State University estimates a continued excess capacity in agriculture of some 50 million acres of land by 1980. On the basis of a U.S. population increase of 1.4 percent per year and an increase of 2 percent in annual per capita income, he estimates a 1.6 percent annual increase in the domestic demand. He estimates the foreign demand to increase at the annual rate of .4 percent which would give a total annual increase in demand of around 2 percent.

He estimates output of agriculture at around 1.7 percent annually on the same acreage as at present without additional outside inputs. With an increase in outside inputs at the rate of .3 percent per year, which he views as modest, he comes out with an annual increase in output of 2 percent and a continued surplus of crop land in U.S. agriculture.

Heady of Iowa State University, likewise, comes out with a similar excess capacity in acres ranging from 32 to 78 million acres by 1980, depending upon the particular assumptions made.

During recent years, five statistical studies have been made which attempted to appraise the impact upon net farm income in the short-run if all farm support programs were withdrawn. These studies indicate a drop of one-fifth to two-fifths in net farm income during the first five transition years. With inadequate supply response data for agriculture there is room for considerable differences in judgment regarding these conclusions. Nevertheless, it appears evident that there would be a substantial drop in net farm incomes the first years that government programs were withdrawn suddenly.

Kaldor, of Iowa State University, concludes that net farm incomes might decline around 25 percent and that per capita farm incomes might decline 15 to 20 percent. This likely substantial decline in incomes, if all support programs were withdrawn suddenly, is sufficiently recognized by nearly all students of the farm problem. They, therefore, recommend a reasonable adjustment period even though they wish to return to completely free prices.

During this adjustment period we believe that a combination of farmer bargaining and marketing cooperatives, in cooperation with government marketing orders, a national agricultural relations act, or similar approaches, could provide a reasonable price increase for farmers plus substantial favorable effects on the terms of sale. Government marketing orders would perhaps be on the commodity-by-commodity basis, based on a market area. Under this plan the government would determine the guidelines and act as a referee and not as a judge.

Farm organizations are agreed that the farmers must retain control of the bargaining process through their own associations. We have made substantial progress in Ohio in developing the Ohio Agricultural Marketing Association into the kind of an organization that can bargain effectively for farmers. However, the government does have a role to play as we have already indicated. We have had considerable success with processing tomatoes, grapes, and a number of vegetables making use of the contract method of marketing.

It has been estimated that for feed grains, wheat, soybeans, cotton, hay, and others, that we would have an expected acreage without diversion in the late sixties of about 330 mil-

lion acres. During 1965-67 our average acreage has been 301 million acres with the feed grain, wheat, and cotton control programs.

People have several objectives for commercial farm policy. Good farm incomes, ample food supply, efficiency, and freedom to make decisions are among them. The realities of markets, however, indicate that these cannot all be achieved at once under present circumstances.

High farm prices and incomes require restraint on production or large government expenditures to increase use of farm products, as by food aid to poor countries. Such measures infringe on the farmers' freedom to produce as they please or make farm income partially dependent on government. On the other hand, complete freedom is likely to mean lower net incomes than the ones farmers found unsatisfactory in 1967. If some compromise is preferred, then alternative programs should be realistically evaluated to find the best combination for income, freedom, and other objectives. The general public will need to be assured that agriculture will supply adequate food and fiber efficiently, that public funds will be put to good use, and that expenditures will not get out of hand.

Throughout the world, and in our own country, there is considerable agitation to place quotas on imports or to follow a high protection policy. The following have been referred to as "The Big Six": Steel, chemical, petroleum, textiles, beef, and dairy. Products that would be adversely affected price-wise by such a policy would be soybeans, feed grains, and wheat. These latter three have often been referred to as "The Billion Dollar Club."

The following table shows how U.S. exports exceeded imports for 1966-67:

TABLE 3.—U.S. exports exceed imports, 1966-67	
[In billions]	
Exports:	
Nonagricultural	\$24.1
Agricultural	6.8
Commercial	5.3
Concessional	1.5
Total	30.9
Imports:	
Nonagricultural	22.0
Agricultural	4.5
Supplementary	2.7
Complementary	1.8
Total	26.5

There is a way to keep imports from seriously damaging prices of agricultural and industrial products produced in this country, but to use quotas as a method would certainly bring quick retaliation from the countries affected. In addition, increase in the price of steel, chemicals, petroleum, and textiles would certainly raise the price of things that the farmer must buy. Rather than quotas, we favor a U.S. Commission on Trade and Tariffs which could take prompt and appropriate action when industries, including agriculture, are experiencing expanded imports that are injuring that industry. The Commission would be authorized and directed to—

(1) Take immediate action to restrict imports when there is evidence of unfair trade practices such as dumping or subsidized prices;

(2) Make prompt determinations and recommendations with respect to temporary relief from import competition which is found to be injuring or threatening injury to any U.S. industry; and

(3) Consider actions under Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

This is a new proposal to establish a Com-

mission which would function with respect to foreign trade in a manner similar to the way the Federal Trade Commission operates with respect to domestic trade. When unfair trade practices are involved, it would have the power to act—not just recommend.

The Commission would be organized so that it would stay abreast of trade developments and give prompt relief when such is warranted.

Agricultural import problems such as have existed in meat and dairy products can be handled better through these improved administrative procedures than by special legislation. Experience with the Meat Import Act of 1964 is dramatic proof of this.

Mr. Ford's Move

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend you, the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler], and your associates in the Democratic leadership in the House for your decision to seek a direct vote by the House on the Senate version of the civil rights bill. The bill represents substantially a combination of what the House of Representatives accepted in 1966 and of what we passed last year, and its speedy enactment into law would represent an inspiring reaffirmation of America's commitment to the ideals upon which this Republic was founded.

I commend to all Members, including particularly those on the other side of the aisle, the following cogent editorial which appeared in the New York Times for March 15:

MR. FORD'S MOVE

The House Democratic leadership has intelligently decided to send the Senate version of the Civil Rights bill directly to the floor for final approval.

Enemies of the bill have been pushing for a House-Senate conference, the chief purpose of which would be to consider weakening amendments to the bill's open-housing section. An effort would certainly be made in conference to add an amendment permitting a property owner to instruct his broker to discriminate racially in the sale or rental of his house. Such an amendment would tear a gaping hole in the bill. There is no basis in law or conscience for giving property owners the power to authorize discrimination.

Representative Gerald Ford, the Republican leader, is the key man in next week's vote as his counterpart, Everett Dirksen, was in the Senate. Because of Southern defections, the majority Democrats cannot put through the Senate version without the cooperation of Mr. Ford and his fellow-Republicans. It is not ideal legislating for either chamber to accept major amendments that its own committees have not considered, but in the give-and-take of the legislative process this procedure is sometimes unavoidable. In this instance, every member of the House is conversant with the open-housing provisions as voted by the Senate, and knows how he stands. Further committee consideration and debate are scarcely necessary.

A vote to go to conference is a vote to delay and weaken the bill. A vote to accept the Senate substitute would speed the bill to the President's desk and bring fresh confidence to all who believe in racial equality.

At a time when racial tensions in this country are acute, Representative Ford and his Republican colleagues will be assuming a grim responsibility if they refuse to open the doors of the ghetto as wide as possible.

Worcester, Mass., Lithuanian Naturalization and Social Club Commemoration of the 50th Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, it was my great honor and privilege to take part in the celebration exercises of Lithuania's 50th anniversary of independence that took place in my home city of Worcester, Mass., on February 18, last, under the sponsorship of the Worcester Lithuanian Naturalization and Social Club.

At this point, I would like to include an article appearing in the February 19, 1968, issue of the Worcester Telegram, describing the events that took place at this celebration, and I have been requested to include my own address to the assembly, together with the remarks of a distinguished Lithuanian American of Worcester, Attorney Anthony J. Miller.

The article and addresses follow:

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram, Feb. 19, 1968]

LITHUANIANS IN CITY NOTE INDEPENDENCE ANNIVERSARY

More than 450 members and guests of the Lithuanian Naturalization and Social Club, 67 Vernon St., attended a speaking program and dinner yesterday marking the 50th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day.

Richard C. Steele, publisher of The Worcester Telegram and the Evening Gazette, spoke to the group about his recent travels through Russia, including Lithuania. He drew parallels between the Lithuanian and Polish situations behind the Iron Curtain and reported on the state of religion in those areas.

U.S. Rep. Harold D. Donohue, D-Worcester, spoke on Lithuanian participation in American life since the arrival in this country of many persons who fled Communism.

Mayor Casdin has issued a city proclamation denoting this week as Lithuanian Independence Week, and the proclamation was read to the audience. Julius Svikla was in charge of the program.

Feb. 19, 1918, was the day the Lithuanian National Council declared its independence from German occupation. Actual independence did not come until July, 1920, and then it came from the Russians. In 1940 Lithuania was again absorbed by the Russians.

SPEECH OF CONGRESSMAN HAROLD D. DONOHUE ON LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE, FEBRUARY 18, 1968

It is always a great honor and pleasure, as your Representative in the United States Congress and as your friend, to join with you in these exercises celebrating the annual anniversary of your native Lithuania's Declaration of Independence.

Almost twenty-eight years have passed since the imperialistic forces of Soviet Russia overwhelmed the brave people of Lithuania and incorporated your native land into the Communist empire as a slave state.

Today, however, we commemorate a happier anniversary in the history of Lithuania and recall that it was just fifty years ago that Lithuania proclaimed her independence.

It is well that we celebrate this great event. It is most fitting that we remember Lithuania's days of liberty. For the spirit of freedom, the love of liberty, the conviction that Lithuania shall one day be free once more lives on in the hearts of the Lithuanian people today just as it lived through more than a century of czarist oppression.

Let us emphasize that Lithuania became a free land four centuries before America was even discovered. That freedom was lost in 1795, only to be regained in 1918. The same Russian imperialism that enslaved Lithuania before holds her in subjugation today. The name of the oppressor's system of government is different—it is a Communist government now but the oppression is even worse.

Through one hundred and twenty-three years of czarist rule, suffering all kinds of cruel hardships, the brave Lithuanian people passed on from generation to generation their national traditions, their love of liberty, their ideal of national freedom and independence. Today's generations still remain steadfast in their determination that Lithuania shall once again know freedom.

No one can exactly foretell when the Communist empire will begin to disintegrate and Lithuania and the other subjugated nations will be freed. But we do know that atheistic communism contains the seeds of its own destruction.

We know that men are not born to willingly accept slavish oppression and persecution. No, all men and particularly the Lithuanian people were born to stand erect before their creator and to freely rule their own national and individual destinies.

We know that sooner or later whoever stands in the way of any people's divine right to freedom must and will eventually be made powerless to dominate and persecute their fellow men.

We know that any nation that must resort to falsehood as an instrument of high policy, that must enslave people in order to control them, that must use mass murder for their barbaric purposes cannot possibly survive.

The history of tyrants in this world is written in blood and infamy and always, in the end, in self-destruction.

So in celebrating today the fiftieth anniversary of Lithuania's independence we are not engaged in a futile exercise nor are we making any passing sentimental gesture.

Rather, we look confidently to the brighter future that must come to all courageous people who remain loyal to the principles of the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God.

I believe that Lithuania cannot be forever held in Communist slavery. I believe we have a very deep obligation to encourage Lithuania and her people in these times of terrible trial and hardships.

I, therefore, introduced a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 183) in the United States Congress on February 8, 1967. This resolution provides that the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America urge the President of the United States to present the Lithuanian and the Baltic States question before the United Nations. The resolution further urges the President to ask that the United Nations request Soviet Russia to withdraw all its troops and agents and controls from Lithuania; to return all Lithuanian exiles from Siberia, from prisons and slave-labor camps; and calls for the United Nations to conduct free elections in Lithuania and the other states.

It was and is my intention, through this resolution, to inspire the people of Lithuania to keep the bright flame of freedom burning in their hearts and to let them know that their friends have not abandoned them.

It is my earnest hope that through this

and other resolutions in the Congress the people in your native land will be reassured that you Lithuanian-Americans and all their American friends will continue to exert every moral and legal resource at our command to help Lithuania get back the independence for which she longs and which she so eminently deserves.

In closing I wish to remind you and all my fellow Americans of the wise and warning words of William Allen White when he said—"whenever a free man is in chains, we are threatened also. Whoever is fighting for liberty is defending America."

Therefore, in our own national interest let us pledge that we will persevere in our efforts until we achieve and joyously celebrate the glorious occasion when Lithuania will once more take her free, rightful and proud place in the family of civilized nations. Let us together pray that happy day will soon occur.

SPEECH OF ATTORNEY ANTHONY M. MILLER

As your fellow American of Lithuanian descent, it is a special privilege for me to join with you, and with our great Congressman, Harold Donohue, in this program commemorating the fiftieth anniversary of the Declaration of Lithuanian Independence.

In all the annals of injustice and oppression, there is none more saddening or heart-rending than the history of our native Lithuania.

For seven centuries, all the forces of evil aggression have combined against Lithuania in an attempt to destroy it.

Successive invasions by teutonic knights, tatars, czarist Russians, Communists, Nazis, and finally Communists again have made of Lithuanian history a series of terrible blood baths, each worse than the one before.

It has been Lithuania's unhappy fate that invasion has invariably been accompanied by deliberate, organized programs of mass murder, extermination, and mass deportation that are unsurpassed and probably unequalled in their cruelty and severity.

All of the extremes of brutality, all of the devices of barbaric minds, have been loosed against our native land in a ceaseless attempt to destroy its national consciousness, its religion, its love of independence and freedom.

Yet, through it all, our people have steadfastly maintained a religious faith, a national identity, and a yearning for independence that will surely be ultimately rewarded.

Through the ordeals of seven centuries, the Lithuanians have given constant testimony to the fundamental truth that man has an inborn yearning for freedom which cannot be destroyed or eliminated.

This fundamental truth, will in the end spell defeat for Communist tyranny, if we keep faith with our ideals. That is the real meaning of this anniversary.

Fifty years ago today, on February 16, 1918, the Republic of Lithuania proclaimed its independence. Two brief decades of liberty and progress followed to be tragically snuffed out by Communist treachery.

During World War II, the United States and the allies pledged, again and again, as a solemn war aim, that the independence of all peoples would be guaranteed.

We proved tragically unequal to the task of translating these guarantees into practical reality. But this failure does not end our moral responsibility to work ceaselessly toward the goal of freedom of Lithuania from the domination of Soviet Russia.

The Communist powers have now, for several years, been engaged in a major campaign to make the civilized world forget the Red atrocities of the past. Through cultural exchanges, good will ambassadors, offers of trade, and soft words, they seek to gain free world acceptance of the status quo in the world today, even while they very likely prepare for future aggressions.

The passing years have dimmed the memories and stilled the consciences of many in the free world.

Wary of war, anxious to reach accommodation with the Communists, many in important places have begun to urge policies that tacitly accept permanent Red domination of Lithuania and the other enslaved nations behind the Iron Curtain.

This fiftieth anniversary of Lithuanian independence should recall to all Americans that we cannot close the door on Lithuania's just claims to independence without betraying our solemn obligations and denying our own free heritage.

I do not believe that the United States will ever abandon the moral commitment to help Lithuania to regain her freedom but I think it is well for us to continue to remind our government and our country of this obligation.

Therefore, I think we should continue to appeal to the President of the United States and our friends in Congress, like our good congressman, Harold Donohue, to vigorously promote our declared policy of the restoration of independence to Lithuania and to reaffirm the determination of the Government of this great country not to be a party to any agreement or treaty which would confirm or prolong the subjugation of Lithuania.

I believe as Lithuanian-Americans we should and must rededicate ourselves to the just cause of Lithuanian freedom. I think that we, as Lithuanian-Americans, have the duty to continue to assure the people in our native land, suffering under Soviet domination, of our unyielding ties to them and of our unyielding determination to spare no efforts and sacrifices for the attainment of the sacred goal of freedom and independence for our glorious Lithuanian nation.

May God speed the accomplishment of our just and righteous cause for our native people and the land we love.

Booming Economy Pushes Corporation Profits to Record \$85.4 Billion Rate

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the latest reports from the Department of Commerce show that profits of American corporations boomed to a record annual rate of \$85.4 billion in the fourth quarter of last year.

This is another example of our surging, expanding economy which is continuing the longest uninterrupted business expansion period in our history.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in our economy, I place the following article from the Sunday Star in the RECORD:

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., March 18, 1968]

CORPORATION PROFITS ZOOM TO RECORD \$85.4-BILLION RATE: \$5.4-BILLION GAIN IN FOURTH QUARTER BIGGEST IN 3 YEARS, U.S. REPORTS

Profits of American corporations zoomed to a record annual rate of \$85.4 billion in the fourth quarter of last year, the Commerce Department has reported. The quarterly gain of \$5.4 billion was the largest in almost three years.

The fourth-quarter surge boosted corporate profits before taxes for the entire year to \$80.8 billion, below the record of \$83.8 billion set in 1966 but slightly higher than the administration had projected for 1967.

The department said the fourth-quarter advance centered in manufacturing, although earnings in the last six months of the year were depressed by strikes, especially in the automobile and copper industries.

In estimating the amount of corporate taxes, the Treasury Department figured on a 1967 level of corporate profits of \$80.1 billion. The slightly higher total will mean a little higher tax take for the government.

For 1968, the Treasury figures a corporate profit rate of \$87 billion over the entire year.

Indications so far are that profits will continue to rise in the current quarter.

Profits before taxes declined for three straight quarters before reversing the trend in the third quarter of last year. The \$5.4 billion surge in the fourth quarter was the highest since the first quarter of 1965, when profits rose \$6.6 billion following settlement of an automobile strike.

Corporate taxes for the fourth quarter of last year ran at an annual rate of \$35.1 billion, while profits after taxes were at an annual rate of \$50.3 billion.

A Dammed Bill Can Result in a Dammed River

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, recently the St. Paul district office of the Army Corps of Engineers announced the completion of a study to build a flood control dam on the St. Croix River above Taylors Falls, Minn.

The St. Croix-Namekagon River system is being considered for inclusion in the so-called wild rivers legislation now before the National Parks Subcommittee of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

An excellent editorial from the St. Paul Pioneer Press, of March 17, 1968, expresses concern that unless there is rapid enactment of a wild rivers bill, which includes the St. Croix-Namekagon, the Army Corps of Engineers may succeed in inundating one of the last remaining great, picturesque river valleys of our country.

I include the editorial as part of my remarks:

A DAMMED BILL CAN RESULT IN A DAMMED RIVER

Members of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers must be direct descendants of the beaver, so persistent are their efforts to build dams.

How else to explain the continued battle of the St. Paul District of the Army Corps to build a dam on the St. Croix River when they know full well there is little public support for the project?

Yet while they are like beavers in their persistence, they are unlike them in their purposes. The beaver builds for a reason, but the Army Corps boys seem to build just for the sake of building. Oh, they say they've got to build for flood control and to provide better recreational facilities, but both these arguments hold water like cheesecloth.

Consider their proposed dam, a 100 to 120-foot-high structure somewhere near the old Nevers Dam which could back up the St. Croix over 75,000 acres, up to and beyond Grantsburg, Wis. The reservoir pool would cover 114 square miles, and as Congressman Joseph Karth said during House hearings

earlier this month, "This picturesque wilderness, one of the most beautiful spots in this country, will be at the bottom of a 40-mile-long lake."

The main purpose of this dam would be to control the potential spring runoff capable of contributing to flood damage. But studies made at peak flows between April 17 and 18, 1965, showed that the Mississippi and Minnesota Rivers contributed four times as much to the confluence at Prescott than did the St. Croix. Its flow at St. Croix Falls was between 43,000 and 45,000 cubic feet of water a second while the Mississippi at Anoka was 90,000 cubic feet, and the Minnesota at Carver was 80,000.

It would seem wiser to try to control the Mississippi or the Minnesota than to tame this smaller, more beautiful river that hasn't already suffered the bite of the Army Corps. If studies indicate that there are no suitable sites along the Mississippi above the Twin Cities for a flood control reservoir, then we ask if just because the St. Croix lends itself to dam, does that mean we need the dam?

The cost of this structure is estimated to be from 50 to 100 million dollars. Yet, floods the likes of which we saw in 1965, by the Corps' own estimates, happen once in 100 years. Is an expensive dam, a forever ruined wild river, and a permanent public displeasure worth it just to prevent raging waters once every 100 years? Is it worth it especially when flood damages for the most part could be prevented if the Army Corps busted themselves with stronger flood plain zoning?

Aside from the flood control argument, the Army Corps also talks about improved recreational advantages which would result from changing the upper St. Croix from a slim, fast, wild river into a dull, placid reservoir-lake. That's a little tough to buy, really, because anyone who has seen such a man-made lake knows that the water level is changing always, according to the needs for water power or normal flows downstream. This results in a lake one day and a driftwood bog the next.

The advantages of a dam on the St. Croix, then, are dubious while the advantages of the river in its present state are not. It is unique in its representation of part of the American terrain not touched by an industrious, but somewhat sacrilegious civilization. This uniqueness is attested to by the fact that the Scenic Rivers bill passed last year by the Senate includes only nine rivers in the nation, one of them the St. Croix.

A similar bill is facing the hurdles of the House. But the struggle is twofold. First, the House bill only applies to the lower St. Croix. Minnesota congressmen are trying to have the upper St. Croix and the Namekagon River included. Second the Army Corps has started to move its approval for dam construction up through channels. Preliminary studies have been completed and forwarded to the Corps' Chicago office; from there they go to Corps headquarters in Washington.

So it looks as if the fate of the St. Croix rests on the outcome of a race. Congressmen interested in saving the River have delayed probably because they've underestimated the drive of the Army Corps. But they're very eager like beavers.

Before the St. Croix is irrevocably damned, the House should amend and pass the national Scenic Rivers bill.

Chairman of Indian Claims Commission

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed pleased that my dear friend, John Vance,

has been recommended by the President as Chairman of the Indian Claims Commission.

John's western background has prepared him well for the responsibilities of this important office and I have complete confidence he will be an effective Chairman and will do an outstanding job for our Indian citizens.

As a Montanan, I have had the opportunity to observe the fine work John has done since graduating from George Washington University Law School in 1950.

In addition to practicing law in Missoula, he has served on the safety commission of that city and on the trade commission for the State of Montana. John was later elected city attorney in Helena, the capital city of Montana.

A veteran, John served with U.S. Armed Forces in the Philippines. Active for many years in the Civil Air Patrol—CAP—he has been commander of the Montana CAP and adviser to the national CAP board.

Before being confirmed by the Senate last fall as a Commissioner of Indian Affairs, John taught as a visiting professor of law at the University of North Dakota School of Law at Grand Forks, N. Dak.

Mr. Speaker, I am personally well aware of John Vance's outstanding record of achievement for the people of my district in western Montana and for the people of this Nation. Because of my deep concern for our Indian population, I commend the President for his excellent recommendation.

Regrettable Political Maneuvering

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that so important a matter as our policy in Vietnam should become entangled in internecine partisan political maneuvering.

Yet this appears to have been the case regarding the aborted proposal that President Johnson and Senator ROBERT KENNEDY resolve their differences through appointment of a special Presidential commission to reassess our Vietnam policy.

That such a commission was not created does not diminish the adverse effect of this publicized proposal on the conduct of our foreign policy. For the very fact that discussions regarding its creation were held among high-ranking administration officials, including the newly appointed Secretary of Defense, and Senator KENNEDY, is evidence of a serious crisis of confidence in policymaking at the top level of our Government.

Certainly our Vietcong enemies could not but find encouragement in this public washing of political party linen.

If indeed the executive branch desires a reexamination of reassessments of Vietnam policy, it is to the Congress, representing that arm of Government

closest to our people, to whom it should turn.

It is to be hoped that this latest Johnson-Kennedy public dispute does not presage future such incidents in which paramount foreign policy issues are virtually made into a campaign year football.

St. Patrick

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, as the Irish people all over the world honor their patron saint on March 17, it is appropriate, I think, to consider what lesson his example offers us in the world of many centuries later. As I think over the story of St. Patrick, I am at once impressed by his deep understanding of people, and his unfailing and unsurpassed sense of diplomacy.

St. Patrick was blessed with all the natural qualifications of the diplomat. He was sincere, he was mild, he was persuasive. He prepared himself thoroughly for his task by living among the people he was to convert, learning their language, their customs, and their hopes and fears. He came to respect and love them, and thus his work among them became a joy to him.

He was no patronizing delegate from afar, come to save them and raise them to his own superior level, but a friend, ready and willing to help when and however he could. He based his work on a careful plan of action. He went to the respected leaders and gained their confidence, if not always their agreement. He always spoke first to the local leaders, never rushing in to subvert their followers, but offering himself to their service. He never antagonized, but he never gave up his gentle, firm efforts.

He knew that people resent radical changes in their way of life, and so he adapted his doctrine to the native customs, making adjustments comfortable to both. He used their pagan sites as places of worship, converting them as necessary. He adapted Christian celebrations of the pagan calendar, and he gave them beautiful and impressive litanies and hymns to replace their pagan charms and chants. He found their laws those of a highly advanced culture, stressing the virtues of justice and charity, and he simply codified them and accentuated the similarities.

He recognized the great respect of the Irish for learning, and established monasteries and schools. He saw that the tales and legends and history of the pre-Christian era were set down and preserved as cherished parts of Irish culture.

He found a land of warlike tribes, and, just a little over 35 years later, he left a land of peaceful people known throughout civilization as a nation of scholars and saints.

What a great deal we can all learn, as we deal with the people of this Nation and the world, from the example

CXIV—444—Part 6

of St. Patrick. We Irish are proud of St. Patrick, and we hope that the story of his life inspires others, as it has inspired us, for centuries.

On behalf of the Flannery and Kelly clans, I wish to extend to all who are Irish by ancestry or affection a very happy St. Patrick's Day.

Hawaii's Dr. Sam Mukaida Lauded as "Mister Okinawa"

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, a noted Japanese newspaper, the Mainichi Daily News, recently featured a warm and sympathetic article about one of Hawaii's most beloved citizens, Dr. Samuel Mukaida.

In his role as Chief of the Cultural Centers Branch of the Office of Public Affairs of USCAR—U.S. Civil Administration of the Ryukyu Islands—Dr. Mukaida has dedicated himself for almost a decade to increasing the knowledge of and appreciation for the culture of the Ryukyuan people among Americans stationed on Okinawa. He has also helped to promote among the Ryukyuan people a better understanding of and pride in their own multifaceted culture.

At present there are five cultural centers in the Ryukyus—at Naha, at Ishikawa, at Nago, and on the major offshore Ryukyuan Islands, Miyako and Yaeyama. Dr. Mukaida stated that well over 3 million people participated in the cultural affairs programs last year, and he is most enthusiastic over the development of his ideas for multipurpose cultural centers.

Other cherished projects initiated by Dr. Mukaida are the government museum at Shuri and the community libraries program, which he calls a "new concept of library as a community center."

Dr. Mukaida has given fully of his own unique artistic energy in his work with the Ryukyuan people, and over the years he has become affectionately known as "Mister Okinawa."

Dr. Mukaida has put his considerable talents to use in many ways for the benefit of the Ryukyuan people, including the development of the Okinawa Children's Junior Chorus, the Women and Home Life Chorus, and the Naha Philharmonic Chorus. He also helped to establish the Ryukyuan International Art League, the Okinawan Symphony Orchestra, and the Okinawa Library Association.

"Mister Okinawa" was born in Kona, Hawaii, and attended the University of Hawaii. His Ph. D. was earned at Columbia University, where he specialized in audiovisual and fine arts education.

Dr. Mukaida and I have been close friends since our student days at the University of Hawaii, and it gives me great pleasure to see one of Hawaii's native sons rendering such outstanding service to the United States and to the people of Okinawa.

I salute this gentle crusader for his contributions to international goodwill,

and I would like to share with my colleagues the story of the life of "Mister Okinawa," as it was told by the Mainichi Daily News.

The article follows:

[From the Mainichi Daily News, Nov. 26, 1967]

DR. SAMUEL MUKAIDA

(By Stuart Friffin)

There was a time when this modest, soft-spoken little man was mistaken for other than who and what he was, and is. This was at a party when, responding to those who encouraged him, the small Hawaiian donned kimono and, without too much difficulty, stepped into another role, a convincing personification of Japan's Emperor Hirohito.

Before that, and after that bit of histrionics, he was and is, just Sam Mukaida, Dr. Sam Mukaida, the very much beloved, simple and dedicated gentleman who is Chief of the Cultural Centers Branch of the Public Affairs Department of USCAR, the U.S. Civil Administration of the Ryukyu Islands.

Dr. Sam, for all his good works and unbending efforts, is known to many, Okinawans and Americans alike, as "Mister Okinawa."

His has been a life of lights and shadows, of much success, of bitter tragedy, an uphill life, lived resolutely, effortlessly, quietly, and with strength.

He was born in Kona, Hawaii, and attended the University of Hawaii before journeying on to continue his education in New York, working his way through Columbia University. Sam majored in curriculum and teaching, and specialized in audio-visual and fine arts education. His Ph.D. was earned at Columbia.

He was in Truk, in the Trust Territories with his wife, Marietta, toward the end of a two-and-a-half-year stint there, when tragedy struck. His wife, mother of the two boys, Allen (now 17) and Donald (now 16) gave birth to Nathan (now 13). She died during that last birth and plunged Sam and his family into grief. Twelve years ago he found himself in Japan, for two years. He was active in independent research on higher education and he was, also, as he says frankly, "on the lookout for a job." He found one, in Okinawa. Doctor Sam had been active on Truk as an education specialist. There he had taught the mid-Pacific natives how to utilize the by-products of copra, making coconut ukuleles, spear fishing with hinged barbs, casting lead sinkers and furniture from coconut logs. He was to give fuller vent to this unique artistic energy in his work with the Ryukyuan people on Okinawa. His fluency in Japanese, too, was to stand him in excellent stead. A singer in his own youthful days, a cellist in his school orchestra, Dr. Sam quite naturally became immediately interested in developing Okinawa's talents musically, chorally, orchestrally. He developed the Okinawa Children's Junior Chorus, the Women & Home Life Chorus and the Naha Philharmonic Chorus that took fifth place in a Japan-wide contest, held in Wakayama, in 1966.

Sam developed the concept of national centers—at Koza, at Kadena, on Zamami Island, and at Itoman, this just recently completed. The museum at Shuri, the Government of the Ryukyus Museum, is a cherished project initiated by this big little man, and so was the development of community libraries, as he calls a "new concept of library as a community center."

Sam Mukaida also organized the Okinawan Women's Advisory Committee to his various Cultural Centers, and he was first and foremost, too, in developing the Ryukyuan American Friendship League, with its year-round program of basketball, baseball, track and field, swimming, and soccer introduced five years ago—and with gymnastics starting up next year. "This League," explains the little

gentleman whose Ph.D. thesis was on a solid "Plan for Establishment of an Audio-Visual Productions Center in the Hawaiian Islands," "is now restricted to the high school level, but we want to broaden it to include elementary and junior high school levels, as well."

The man whose name translates into English as, "Over the Rise Paddies," has now rounded out 10 years on Okinawa, as he explained on this latest of many official trips to Japan. He is the only non-Ryukyuan in his entire vast program that relies on a total of 66 Okinawan men and women—30% veterans of training and orientation in the U.S.—for its overwhelming success.

There are five Cultural Centers in the Ryukyus—at Naha, at Ishikawa, at Nago, and on the major offshore Ryukyuan Islands, Miyako and Yaeyama. The man who established the Ryukyuan International Art League, the Okinawan Symphony Orchestra, the Okinawa Library Association, says what he does as a Public Information Officer with USCAR. "I work with the cultural centers; with guiding and assisting those individuals and organizations interested in literary work, museum work, music, cultural properties, arts and handicrafts, youth's and woman's activities, and Ryukyuan-American community relations programs; with intercultural exchange activities, and, generally speaking, with planning, directing and supervising those activities which accomplish the objectives of the Office of the High Commissioner. I try to promote," he adds—and surely the success of his efforts can be viewed on all sides—"a knowledge, understanding and appreciation among Americans stationed in the Ryukyu Islands of the Ryukyuan people, their culture and their way of life. I also try to promote the Ryukyuan people's knowledge of, and pride in, their own culture." His is a world of libraries, film service libraries, adult education programs, exhibits, recreational and musical and sports programs, Japanese and English language teaching programs, drama groups, lectures, film shows, book deposits, mobile Cultural Center activities, discussion groups and above all, hard, concentrated, effective work. The man, who, with his second wife, Yoshi, from Okinawa, has added two boys to the family in Frank (18 months) and William (3 months) builds his own home in Okinawa today, in the Ameku area of Naha.

"Well over 3.1 million people participated in our cultural affairs programs last year," says Dr. Sam, known far and wide as "Mister Okinawa" because of his many articulate TV appearances explaining the multi-faceted Ryukyuan culture, "and as they say, why change a winning game? Why not stay and see the number rise year by year, especially when my idea of a multipurpose cultural center is taking such broad effective shape as it is."

President's Message Faces up to Washington's Dual Nature

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's message on the District of Columbia clearly recognizes the problems facing our Nation's Capital and offers realistic programs to solve them.

Washington is a unique city for it is at the same time the home of 800,000 people and the Capital City for a nation of 200 million.

President Johnson's message recognizes both of these facets of Washington, D.C.

To improve conditions for the residents of the District the President offers a renewed attack on crime, an increased effort to improve education and housing in the District, and a determination to find jobs for Washington's jobless. It seeks to further strengthen and unify the District Government and to put the District's Federal payments on a sound and sensible basis.

But this message also treats Washington as the First City for all Americans and seeks to make it the beautiful and cultured city every American longs for.

Permanent status is recommended for the Commission to revitalize Pennsylvania Avenue. An addition is proposed to the National Gallery so that it can better serve the Nation's visitors and school children. And the President has urged creation of an International Center for Scholars to make Washington the educational hub of the world.

A more beautiful, a more livable, a more cultured Washington—these are the hopes of the President's message. We in Congress must make them a reality.

Human Renewal Fund

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, the number of Members of the House who support and endorse the Human Renewal Fund is approaching 70. In addition, the idea that the fiscal year 1969 budget can be cut by \$6.5 billion with \$2.5 billion of that cut being fed back into top priority needs in the Nation is attracting wider and wider editorial support.

The need to identify priorities, reduce spending and to meet our pressing and urgent urban problems cannot be ignored any longer.

At this point in the RECORD I am pleased to insert an editorial broadcast by WMAL in Washington during the week of March 10, 1968.

The editorial follows:

HUMAN RENEWAL FUND

(Broadcast during the week of March 10, 1968)

A large group of progressive Republican Congressmen has proposed a \$2.5 billion Human Renewal Fund to combat inner-city desperation. At the same time, they want to cut Federal spending in non-essential areas by \$6.6 billion. This proposal deserves far more attention than it is likely to receive.

The strength of the proposal is the stress on setting priority needs. Creating jobs, educational opportunity and housing in the ghettos is given high priority. Maintaining a huge standing army in Europe, foreign aid, the farm subsidy boondoggle and the like are given low priority.

In addition, total Federal spending would be cut to hold down inflation. Inflated prices are the worst enemy of the poor.

According to Maryland Representative Charles Mathias, the President's new budget cuts \$613 million from existing urban programs. In light of the well-documented plight of our cities, we believe a priority program such as the GOP Congressmen suggest is entirely in order.

District Artist

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure of being acquainted with a unique individual. He is an artist. His name is Jan Wittenber. I cannot attest to his ranking in the world of art but I can attest to his humanity and service to his fellowman. Recently he initiated an art program of sketches and murals for the Dixon State School, an institution for the retarded. This warmhearted man, with the assistance of the Chicago Tribune and the Chicago American, rallied artists from many places and put them to work providing a little color and beauty for the patients. I applaud his energy, humanity, and dedication.

The story of his efforts, chronicled in the Dixon State School Reporter, follows:

DRAWINGS FOR DIXON

Chicago artists and art students are busily engaged in preparing designs on murals to be attached to the walls of some of the buildings at DSS. The project is part of an extensive effort to brighten the atmosphere for residents of the school.

Known as "Drawings for Dixon," the project was begun by Jan Wittenber, a Chicago artist who does volunteer teaching of arts and crafts at DSS. Their artwork includes sketches of clowns, animals, figures out of ancient folklore, and other bits of whimsy to brighten the walls at DSS.

Here is how the program for "Drawings for Dixon" got started. Jean Slocum, DSS Supervisor of Volunteer Services, felt that murals would be a fine thing in one of the buildings. Wittenber agreed but wondered why one building should be a special sort of show case. It seemed to him that others could stand a little color and beauty too. In fact, he revealed, that inspired by his experience at DSS, he had painted a picture entitled "The Shut In." The picture shows a young woman behind heavy black bars, looking wistfully out into a world which she no longer shares. This, he felt was the way men, women, and children feel when they are forgotten by their relatives and friends, and condemned to spend their lives in an institution, alone and unloved.

Being a man of action, Wittenber wrote to Jack Mabley of Chicago's American. He requested that artists and art students throughout the Chicago area be appealed to in this manner. If they could not come to Dixon, he said he would furnish transportation for them, or collect material volunteered. Canvas would be available as a result of contributions by the Joanna Western Mills Company, Chicago, Illinois. The sketches would be used as part of the material for a mural and the designed figures could be permanently attached to DSS walls. Within a few days eight artists had already called him and started on their way toward bringing cheer to the shut-ins at Dixon.

In addition, the artist arranged to speak next month at the University of Illinois Circle Campus to enlist the help of advanced art students in making designs on murals that could be used permanently on walls. He has the promises of art assistance from students on the University of Chicago art staff who are working toward their art degree. In addition, other Chicago newspapers, including the Chicago Tribune, have promised to publicize the project pictorially and enlist the support of other Chicago artists and art students.

Wittenber's dedication to art has taken him to almost every state in the union. He was born in the Dutch Indies, and he was brought by his father first to the Netherlands and later to the United States. He has exhibited in the Art Institute at Chicago and was awarded first prize in a competition of independent Chicago artists.

If any area residents want to take part in "Drawings for Dixon," they may write or call the Health Educator at DSS.

Address of Maj. Gen. Yitzhak Rabin,
Ambassador of Israel

HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the pleasure of hearing a most enlightening and moving address regarding the current Arab-Israel conflict. This address was given by His Excellency Maj. Gen. Yitzhak Rabin, Ambassador of Israel, before the ninth annual policy conference, American-Israel Public Affairs Committee, here in Washington, D.C., on March 11.

Confident that my colleagues will appreciate Ambassador Rabin's remarks as much as I did, I herewith present the full text for inclusion in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY MAJ. GEN. YITZHAK RABIN, AMBASSADOR OF ISRAEL, BEFORE THE NINTH ANNUAL POLICY CONFERENCE, AMERICAN-ISRAEL PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 11, 1968

I would try to describe to you tonight the main problems of the Arab-Israel conflict. The day-to-day events reported in the press do not necessarily reflect the real problems. An explosion in a Jerusalem building, artillery fire exchanges along the Jordan River, a terrorist gang captured in the vicinity of Nablus—these are the by-products of the disease, not their underlying causes. As with every disease, it is far more important to get at its roots, than to treat its external symptoms. The Arab-Israel conflict goes back many years. It has been played upon and influenced by emotional factors, by baser instincts fed by religious and national prejudices.

It is not easy to distinguish between the significant and the trivial in the Middle East—unless one has an intimate knowledge of the region—unless one follows closely the course of events there, day by day, and even hour by hour. The striking characteristic of the conflict is that the opponents are totally dissimilar in their final aims. Each of the two parties to the conflict seeks entirely different goals. The aim of the Arab States is Israel's destruction. Israel's aim is peaceful accommodation of itself in the Middle East. One side strives towards a situation in which the other side is to be eliminated; and the other side seeks to secure its mere existence, in peace and tranquillity. In this respect I know of no other conflict in the world comparable with the Arab-Israel conflict. There are a great number of conflicts and wars going on in the world today. Some of these arise from territorial disputes, others from disputes over forms of government and regime. Some arise from the will of one people to conquer and dominate its neighbors. But a situation in which one nation or group of nations seeks to wipe out entirely its adversary is unique to the Arab-Israel conflict. The ultimate aim of the Arabs is extermination. Therefore, as long

as this aim has not been achieved, they have to decide on an intermediate policy. They choose the policy of non-acceptance and non-recognition of Israel. Recognition, acceptance of Israel would be fundamentally in contradiction with their declared ultimate aim. Some of their leaders still believe that this is the stage of laying the necessary groundwork for the future. For the past twenty years we have witnessed an Arab policy of deliberately ignoring Israel's existence. Some of you may consider what I have been saying at best as exaggerated, at worst as biased, subjective propaganda. You might ask, is it possible today, in the mid-20th century, to destroy a nation? How is it possible that any state in our day and age could harbor so reckless a purpose?

Ladies and gentlemen, the experience of Jewish history has previously shown us how such a thing is possible: it is only thirty years since the Jewish people witnessed what was perhaps the most awful tragedy ever in our long history. We saw how a demented dictator came to power in a great European nation, with its historic culture and traditions, and harbored just such a purpose—and carried it out. Some here tonight may remember the voices saying then that such a thing could never happen. Many, many people, Jew and Gentile alike, would not believe the reports when they first began to trickle through, of the elaborate machinery of systematic genocide set in motion. The reality turned out to be even more terrible than the reports. Six million were destroyed, methodically. Why? Because they were Jews; because as their luck had it, they did not even have the chance to stand and fight back effectively.

It might be said that this could only happen under a Hitler, in the demented regime of Nazi Germany, that it could never happen again. I shall not go back as far as 1948, only back to the second half of May, 1967. The armed forces of Egypt, Jordan, Syria, and Iraq had concentrated along the length and breadth of Israel's borders. Hundreds of thousands of Arab troops were ready for battle, armed with the latest military equipment, tanks, planes, artillery, and all the other weapons of destruction. The noose around our necks tightened. The plan was perfect, but the victim refused to cooperate, was determined to survive, to prevent his own destruction. Do we need to apologize for foiling our intended assassins? Can there be any doubt about what would have been our fate if the Arab armies had triumphed?—about what would have happened to us if we had been defeated? There is no need to cite the Egyptian President's statements of May 26, 28, and 30. What he said was quite clear and unequivocal. It was said to the world at large, over radio and television. This was only nine months ago, and I am sure that you all remember it well. We all recall the wave of sympathy and compassion for the Jewish people which swept the civilized world after the holocaust of World War II. We do not want any more post-mortem sympathies. We came to Israel to reestablish an Israel society based on traditional Jewish values and progressive Western civilization. Our national and cultural self-determination have afforded us the conditions, the opportunity, and the means of self-defence. We have demonstrated that we are as capable as any other people in this world of defending ourselves.

The developments leading up to the Six-Day War were sudden and dramatic. I doubt whether anyone at the end of April 1967 could have foreseen an outbreak at the beginning of June like that of the Six-Day War. We might well ask ourselves how so sudden a development was possible, and how it came about. Its origin lies in the reality with which we have lived for the past twenty years, since our Independence. The very same developments which led up to the Six-Day

War can repeat themselves at any time, at any moment—as long as the policy of the Arab States remains belligerency, and as long as they remain unreconciled to the fact of Israel's existence, as long as their declared aim is the destruction of Israel.

Any real and sincere effort to prevent war in the Middle East must first of all address itself to this problem. Israel seeks peace, with all her heart, but the basic condition for a real peace is mutual recognition and a common understanding. These are the guiding lines of Israel's every action and policy. When we affirm our policy of direct negotiations to settle all the problems at issue, this is not some stubborn insistence on one particular course or tactic. Our insistence is that negotiations must be direct, between our neighbors and ourselves, whether it be in the presence or under the auspices of the U.N. representative. And this is no pointless obstinacy. How can real or lasting arrangements be concluded in any other way? The whole root of the evil is the Arab policy of non-reconciliation and non-recognition.

Any international approach acknowledging this Arab policy can only frustrate every possibility of getting at the roots of the Arab-Israel conflict. Any approach intimating international approval or endorsement of Arab refusal to recognize us, or allowing them to evade the basic necessity of reaching agreement with us directly, any such approach will fail to solve the tensions in the Middle East. It is not the rights of a victor that we are claiming. All we ask, and claim, is recognition as an equal party, in any solution. We have had our experience of arrangements made without direct negotiation. In 1957, the I. D. F. evacuated the Sinai Peninsula, on the strength of inadequate international arrangements. An international emergency force was established, and thirteen Maritime Powers guaranteed free passage in the Straits of Tiran. It took two days for that emergency force to vanish away. It is better to pass over in silence what became of the guarantee of the Maritime Powers. All who really and sincerely want peace must first and foremost do nothing to enable the Arabs to evade the basic essentials. Basic essentials mean Arab settlement with Israel of their outstanding differences.

We are well aware of the fact that the Arab-Israel conflict is too intricate and complex. But we have had to fight three wars in the last twenty years. While we may have come out on the winning side, it isn't wars we want but peace. I have been a soldier all my life. I know how cruel and harsh war is, with its tragedy and bloodshed. The Six-Day War may appear to have been a "famous victory", and indeed it was. Our 830 dead and 3,000 wounded may appear to have been a small price to pay. In proportion to the dimensions of the war and the forces involved, it was not a high price to pay for our survival. But this is not true in terms of any national calculation. 830 dead is a high proportion of our population. Our casualties in the Six-Day War were higher than the proportionate total of United States casualties in the Korean and Viet Nam War put together. And this was all in six days, not in fifteen years. We do not seek wars, even if we know that we are not going to be the losers. What we want is to prevent war, to deter our enemies from aggression against us, in the absence of peace.

Bitter experience has taught us that the only way to prevent war is through military, economic, and political strength. We don't want anyone else to fight our wars for us. Our citizens are ready, able, and prepared to defend their lives and protect our national existence. The fact that the Arabs are 60 million and we 2½ million does not alarm us. The only thing that we ask of our friends throughout the world is to let us have the means, the equipment, to defend ourselves.

The Arab states have the backing of a Great Power. This power has no inhibitions, moral or otherwise, in its unlimited support of the Arab States. It is pouring an abundance of weaponry, of very high quality, into the Arab States. They have thousands of their military advisors, instructors, and technicians in the Arab States. The Egyptian President has told the editor of Look magazine that there are barely one thousand. This is far from the true figure, one of the many inaccurate statements in the interview. The true figure is double and even triple that. The military presence of that World Power in the Middle East is an established fact. If Alexandria and Port Said are not described as military bases of that power, it is a mere matter of semantics. The permanent presence of the Power's naval vessels in those harbors makes them bases in fact if not in name.

The question which the world must answer is whether to support the cause of war or the cause of peace, the cause of negotiation and settlement or the cause of non-recognition of a nation's right of very existence.

I should like to take this opportunity of expressing the appreciation of my country for the understanding and help we have had from the United States. I say so especially in regard of the United States Government's efforts to achieve a just and lasting peace in the Middle East, a policy set forward by President Johnson in his statement of June 19, 1967.

After twenty years of statehood, Israel's struggle is still for her very existence. But we hope and believe that peace will come to the Middle East. The road to it might be a long one. We know that it would entail sacrifice, suffering, and heavy burdens on us. We have no other choice. It is our belief that our cause is deserving of the support of the nations of the free world.

Freedom of Information for the District of Columbia

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to bring the government of the District of Columbia under the provisions of the Freedom of Information Act. A similar measure has been introduced in the Senate by Senator EDWARD V. LONG, of Missouri, who coauthored the public disclosure law which went into effect on July 4, 1967.

The legislation we are proposing will bring about uniformity in the application of the information law at all levels of government in the Nation's Capital, and of equal importance it will give Washington's new Mayor and City Council a long needed tool of statutory authority to disclose records and documents to the public—a positive authority they do not have at present.

I might add that the present officials of the District of Columbia, as in the case of their recent predecessors, have evidenced their desire to comply with the spirit of the freedom-of-information law, and that their cooperation in this respect has held local government information problems to a minimum.

The new bill has been referred to my Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information, and will be given consideration at an early date.

Unitarian Universalist Resolution on Vietnam War

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, at the last general assembly of the Unitarian Universalist Association, the delegates adopted by greater than a two-thirds majority vote a resolution on Vietnam again urging "the United States to reconsider its policy in Vietnam and to explore solutions other than military."

I include this resolution as part of the RECORD at this point because I think it is worth the careful consideration of Members of Congress and readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD generally.

The resolution follows:

Vietnam

Whereas, the 1966 (Fifth) General Assembly of the Unitarian Universalist Association passed the following resolution reaffirming the intent of its 1964 resolution urging "the United States to reconsider its policy in Vietnam and to explore solutions other than military," the Unitarian Universalist Association—

Notes again that the present war in Vietnam threatens to escalate into a world nuclear war;

Urges the Government of the United States to negotiate with any and all principals in the conflict, including the National Liberation Front, in seeking a cease-fire, the holding of internationally-supervised free elections, and in aiding in the formation of a representative government of South Vietnam; and

Transmits to the President and the Congress its continued deep concern for an immediate peace in Vietnam.

The Sixth General Assembly of the Unitarian Universalist Association reaffirms its previous resolution and further:

1. Commends the Secretary-General of the United Nations for the initiative he has taken in seeking a cease-fire and peace in Vietnam and endorses his specific proposals for:

(a) Cessation of the bombing of North Vietnam, and

(b) The scaling down of all military operations by all parties in Vietnam, and

(c) Discussions among all parties directly involved in the conflict.

2. Urges the United States government to take substantial immediate and long term steps of de-escalation without any prior conditions placed on the National Liberation Front and the North Vietnam government.

3. Urges the government of the United States to give its citizens accurate and complete information about events in Vietnam, and to recognize that responsible debate on United States policies in Southeast Asia and opposition to the war should not be equated with a lack of patriotism.

4. Encourages immediate public and private efforts to heal the wounded civilians of all Vietnam, and to reconstruct and develop the war-ravaged land.

5. Transmits again to the President and the Congress its continued deep concern for immediate peace in Vietnam.

6. Urges member churches and fellowships through congregational action to take a public position on the war in Vietnam.

7. Urges, in view of the continuing difficulty in inducing any unilateral steps toward peace by any of the parties to the conflict that there be a reciprocal de-escalation, including the progressive removal of all foreign troops and the grounding of all foreign aircraft in North and South Vietnam and that

the use of terrorism and murder by all parties against the people of Vietnam be terminated.

Status of Firearms Legislation

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert in the RECORD the excellent summary of the firearms legislation pending in the Congress put out by the National Shooting Sports Foundation, Inc.

That newsletter points out that the antigun faction in Washington is deliberately blocking passage of legislation which will control passage of firearms into the hands of mental incompetents, fugitives, drunks, narcotics addicts, and other persons similarly unsuited. The reason, as that excellent article points out, is that those pushing legislation like S. 1, the Dodd bill, seek not control over firearms passing into the hands of these unfortunate categories of people, but seek rather to strip law-abiding citizens of their right to own firearms for legitimate sporting and defense purposes.

The article follows:

SUMMARY OF THE STATUS OF MAJOR FIREARMS LEGISLATION PENDING IN CONGRESS

The anti-gun faction in Washington is blocking passage of gun control bills.

The Dodd-Administration bloc has been unable to pass its own bills but at the same time has blocked passage of sportsmen-backed bills which would tighten up the National and Federal Firearms Acts.

Apparently the attitude of this group is that if they cannot pass their own bill, S. 1, Amendment 90, they do not want anything else to be passed. The Dodd bill is now in its seventh version over a five-year period. Each time the Dodd bill has not passed, it has been changed to be more restrictive. Instead of compromising, the anti-gun forces have made successive bills more objectionable.

The anti-gun forces have never offered a reasonable compromise. Apparently they would rather have an issue than a law.

They have refused to allow passage of any bill which would amend the National Firearms Act to include bazookas, cannons and heavy military ordnance. The National Firearms Act, passed in 1934, controls "gangster-type" weapons such as machine guns and sawed-off shotguns.

No organized group, representing any interests, has ever testified against putting bazooka-type weapons in the National Act. In fact, all of the major sportsmen organizations in America have favored passage of Senator Roman Hruska's S. 1854 which would do just that and take care of heavy weapons once and for all.

Despite the predictions of riots this summer, the Administration forces have blocked the Hruska bill, and others, which would give law enforcement authorities the controls they need for bazooka-type weapons.

The Administration has instead mixed heavy ordnance with sporting firearms in its current version of S. 1 to amend the Federal Firearms Act. They have used the threat of heavy military ordnance as propaganda to help passage of their bill on sporting firearms.

If the anti-gun forces really wanted a bazooka bill, they could pass it tomorrow by simply putting it in the National Firearms Act, where it logically fits. Sportsmen have

not only never opposed this control but have repeatedly endorsed it.

The essential difference between the Administration's bill to control sporting firearms in their S. 1 and Sen. Hruska's S. 1853 is one of basic philosophy.

The Dodd-Administration bill is based on total bans. The Hruska approach is based on regulation.

If the National Firearms Act, which regulated machine guns and does not ban them, can work for 34 years on the basic theory of regulation, sportsmen feel that controls on sporting firearms can work through regulation.

If the Administration forces really wanted legislation, they could swing their support in a reasonable compromise to the two Hruska bills and get them passed easily.

The current deadlock gets back to the question of whether the anti-gun faction wants an issue or firearms controls.

A Tribute to Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Gardner

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, most Members of Congress know John W. Gardner, Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare from July 1965 through February 1968, as a highly capable, experienced, and truly dedicated public servant who can look back on his service in the Federal Government with a justified sense of accomplishment, a feeling which I am certain is widely shared in this body. But to the staff of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, he has meant even more than this; he was a leader who stood out among his colleagues in commitment and in dedication. Few tributes can equal the farewell message signed by a representative group of HEW employees and presented to Secretary Gardner last month prior to his departure from office. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY, 21, 1968.

DEAR SECRETARY GARDNER: The recent announcement of your resignation as Secretary of HEW is met with both despair and admiration. Perhaps by some this news was received with surprise, but not by us who shared your concepts and desires, for we also shared your frustrations and disappointments.

Many new employees were attracted to the Department because they sensed your commitment and wished to be a part of the revitalized HEW which welcomed its responsibilities and believed in its missions. Many older employees also recognized and welcomed that HEW's gait had changed from plodding to prodding. Obviously, you were aware of this, Mr. Secretary, for in your January, 1968 report to us you said:

"People react strongly to the 'climate' of an organization. If an organization is to accomplish great things, it is essential to create an atmosphere conducive to such accomplishment. Thanks to the responsiveness and good spirit of people throughout the Department during this period, we have had such an atmosphere . . .

"We have had a climate conducive to innovation. Many of the new initiatives that emerged during this period are traceable to that climate."

Your sudden resignation substantiates our feeling that an unfavorable climate now exists.

Mr. Secretary, those who stay will miss you. They will miss your leadership, your emotional commitment, your intellectual grasp of the importance of HEW as the principal agent for the fulfillment of the promises of our democracy. Under your guidance HEW blossomed for the first time and our mission was a proud and important one. In our democracy, missions—priorities—have changed. Therefore, in sympathy with your resignation we acknowledge our deep trouble. We know, as do you, Mr. Secretary, that all casualties of war do not occur on battlefields. We abhor the direct loss of life, as well as the loss of opportunity to wage a battle against poverty and disease in this country. Yet, as most Americans, we can reach no consensus about the political and moral justifications for war. But we are unanimous in seeing no justification whatsoever for permitting "Too many children and too many adults in this free society (to) still live under the subtle but powerful tyrannies of ignorance, disease, want, discrimination, physical handicap or mental illness. Those tyrannies keep them dependent. We want to be free and strong."

We deplore the unconscionable and unnecessary waste and loss of life wrought by domestic tyrannies.

The recent announcement of your resignation as Secretary of HEW is met with both admiration and despair.

Sincerely,

Pasadena Marine Dies in Vietnam

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pfc. Donald E. Jones, a young marine from Maryland, was killed recently in Vietnam. I wish to commend the courage of this fine young man and to honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD.

PASADENA MARINE DIES IN VIETNAM: PFC. DONALD JONES IS KILLED ON HILL NEAR KHE SANH

A Pasadena (Md.) youth has been killed in Vietnam while defending Hill 861 near the besieged Khe Sanh military base, it was announced yesterday.

Pfc. Donald E. Jones, 19, was killed March 8 from fragmentation wounds from enemy mortar fire in Quang Tri province, according to a Defense Department telegram received by his wife, Mrs. Linda G. Jones.

Private Jones had been in Vietnam since January and was assigned to the 3d Marine Division in Khe Sanh before being sent to Hill 861.

Private Jones attended Northeast High School in Pasadena. He was an apprentice brick mason before enlisting in the Marines last August. He had his basic training at Parris Island, S.C., and was sent to Camp Pendleton in California before leaving for Vietnam.

According to his mother, Mrs. Mary Jones, her son said in his letters that "conditions were horrible" and complained of irregular mail delivery.

Before enlisting he lived with his wife at 4402 Donna drive in Pasadena.

Besides his wife and mother, he is survived by his father, Jack R. Jones; two brothers,

Gary and Paul Jones, both of Pasadena; a stepbrother, Ray Wilson, of Pasadena; and three sisters, Mrs. Mary L. Lehman, of Pasadena; Mrs. Jackie Austin, of Glen Burnie, and Miss Brenda Jones, of Pasadena.

How a Free People Conduct a Long War

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Gus Tyler is extremely timely and will be of particular interest at this time to the Congress and to the people of our great country:

HOW A FREE PEOPLE CONDUCT A LONG WAR
(By Gus Tyler, ILGWU Assistant President, is a national board member of Americans for Democratic Action)

Late one night, a friendly Senator discussed the war with the President at the White House. The conflict was running wrong, and too long. The fighting was going into its third year with no end in sight. In recent weeks, the enemy had shown new strength, putting the great and powerful United States on the defensive. From the anguished bowels of the nation arose the cry for "peace." It came from the opposition and from the President's own party. But the man in the White House was obdurate.

The press did not spare him. They reminded him of the many men who had died in the uniform of the United States, and they reminded him again as the number mounted. They charged him with despotism, with a brutal draft, with suppression of dissent, with strangling civil liberties. They charged that the President's insane obsession with the war was bringing the country to ruin: internal rebellion, riots, inflation, outrageous taxation. They charged him with lying to the country, getting it into a limited war on one pretext and then waging an extended war for his own crazy, crusading purpose. They charged that he had allowed his generals to take over the running of the war.

Within his own party, leaders were looking around for a candidate to run against him for the nomination. Challenging his conduct of an unconstitutional war, Congressional leaders were preparing impeachment proceedings.

The President himself was weary and without friends. Those who should have rallied to his support accused him of incompetence, faintheartedness, and even a sneaking sympathy with the foe. He was being pecked to death by doves and hawks alike.

These were the things that Senator Orville Hickman Browning mused about with the President of the United States. The slow-speaking Chief Magistrate reached for a pamphlet that had apparently been his bedside companion in these difficult days. He commended it to the Senator as proper reading for men laden with the responsibilities of carrying on the most unpopular war in the nation's history. The booklet was entitled, "How a Free People Conduct a Long War," and was written by a Philadelphian, Charles Janeway Stillé.

On that night of December 29, 1862, Mr. Lincoln read to Browning from the document for an hour or more. But he was reading for himself, too. The President was going through an ordeal other Presidents had experienced—Washington during the Revolution, Madison during the War of 1812. He was confronted with the fact that a freedom-loving people are also a peace-loving people, who consider it their right—indeed, their duty—to resist any ruler seeking to drag on

the populace into a war that is too pointless or too painful.

Things had not gone well for Lincoln in December of 1862. On the 13th of that month, General Ambrose Burnside saw the flower of his Army of the Potomac wither under the fire of Lee's veterans at Fredericksburg. In the West, the Army of the Cumberland was stalled in its tracks at Murfreesboro. Sherman was having difficulty at Vicksburg.

Lincoln sensed still more trouble ahead. And when spring followed winter, Lee moved his armies north into Pennsylvania, threatening Meade at Gettysburg. The conquest of the South seemed far, far away in a never-never land of Lincoln's fantasy.

Bad as the military situation was for Lincoln, the political situation was worse. When a military appropriation bill came before Congress on December 18, the Midwestern Democratic delegation pointedly abstained—almost to a man. They never wanted the war and were now doubly bitter at the thought that the President, who had said it was a war to preserve the Union, had turned it into a war to liberate the Negro.

In January 1863, the handsome, brittle, brilliant spokesman of the Midwestern Democrats, Clement Vallandigham, spoke the heart of the peace people on the floor of the House:

"Defeat, debt, taxation, sepulchres, these are your trophies. In vain the people gave you treasure, and the soldier yielded up his life. . . . The war for the Union is, in your hands, a most bloody and costly failure. The President confessed it on the 22nd of September, solemnly, officially and under the broad seal of the United States. . . . War for the Union was abandoned; war for the Negro openly begun, and with stronger battalions than ever before. With what success? Let the dead at Fredericksburg and Vicksburg answer.

"And now, sir, can this war continue? Whence the money to carry it on? Where the men? Can you borrow? From whom? Can you tax more? Will the people bear it?"

Vallandigham slashed at Lincoln's endless appetite for more and more men, for his endless escalation of the war. "Seventy-five thousand first . . . then 83 thousand more were demanded; and 310 thousand responded. . . . The President next asked for 400 thousand, and Congress gave him 500 thousand; and, not to be outdone, he took 637 thousand. Half of these melted away in their first campaign; and the President demanded 300 thousand more for the war, and then drafted yet another 300 thousand for nine months. The fabled hosts of Xerxes have been outnumbered."

Although a lame-duck Congressman, Vallandigham was no man to be pushed aside. The descendant of a conscience-driven Huguenot and a Scotch-Irish mother, he spoke for the "butternut" counties of the Midwest and for the "peace" Democrats. He ended his speech with the warning that "popular uprisings" are being readied in the North, and a new civil war is in the making between New England and the West.

Vallandigham was arrested on the order of General Burnside, as were others, for seditious utterances likely to interfere with recruiting. The ex-congressman was sentenced to jail for the duration; Lincoln commuted the sentence to exile to the Confederacy. In protest, the Democratic party of Ohio named Vallandigham unanimously as its candidate for governor.

The Illinois convention of the party adopted the following resolution: "That the further offensive prosecution of this war tends to subvert the Constitution and the government, and entail upon this nation all the disastrous consequences of misrule and anarchy."

The Iowa convention resolved "that our Union was formed in peace, and can never be perpetuated by force of arms, and that a re-

publican government held together by the sword becomes a military despotism."

In Connecticut, the platform declared that "the time has now arrived when all true lovers of the Constitution are ready to abandon 'the monstrous fallacy' that the Union can be restored by the armed hand alone; and we are anxious to inaugurate such action, honorable alike to the contending sections, and unite all the States upon terms of equality as members of one Confederacy."

And in New York City, Democratic party leader Fernando Wood told an overflow meeting at Cooper Union: "This war of the General Government against the South is illegal, being unconstitutional, and should not be sustained if we are to regard the Constitution as still binding and in force."

Through the winter of 1862, Lincoln feared that the enemy was not the military foe without but the political foe within. "These are dark hours," wrote Senator Charles Sumner to a friend. "The President tells me that he now fears 'the fire in the rear'—meaning the Democracy, especially at the Northwest—more than our military chances." Before the next summer was ended, the "fire in the rear" came not only from the Northwest but more ominously from New York City.

When Lee attacked Gettysburg, Lincoln drained several Eastern states, including New York, of all ready soldiery as a stop-gap prior to securing new troops through a draft. The conscription call raised a storm of protest all over the country.

"For the nation as a whole," wrote a contemporary, "the Civil War reached its darkest military day and its point of greatest unpopularity in the spring of the year 1863. Every description of discontent and disaffection towards the Lincoln Administration controlling the National Government was at its climax in the early summer of that year. At no time before or afterwards was Mr. Lincoln himself so grossly underrated or so outrageously libeled by all his critics, patriotic or reverse."

New York City was up in arms—not against Lee but against Lincoln: "The people would have none of the despised and despotic draft, especially at this moment when Honest Abe, at the nadir of his rule, was viewed as one of the most dishonest men of all times: killer, despot, abolitionist, liar, jokester. The ugly volcano of hatred for the war and the President that had long been seething under the city now exploded. Opposition to the draft turned into a riot, bringing New York to near ruin. More than a thousand people were killed in three days; other thousands died later of wounds. Whole blocks were burned to the ground. Much needed troops were brought in to restore order.

Disaffection, however, was not limited to New York nor to the draft. In six months, Illinois arrested 2,001 deserters. In Mississippi, the Illinois 109th regiment got so involved with fraternization and was so depleted by desertions that the entire regiment was disarmed and placed under arrest. "They were disgusted with Lincoln and the Emancipation Proclamation, said they had enlisted to fight for the Union, not Negro freedom," records Sandburg in his long Lincoln study.

The peace theme was put to music:

"Abram Lincoln, what yer 'bout?
Stop this war! It's all played out—"

Nasty poems appeared regularly in a hostile press:

"How changed—how strange is everything
We had a Union once—
A Statesman for a President,
But now we have a dunce."

Or more heavy-handed invective, such as:

"May Heaven's curses, dark and dire,
Commingle with Almighty fire,
Fall on your head and press you down,
With dreadful torture to the ground."

While he was under attack from both doves and Democrats, the President's own Republican Radicals launched a dump-Lincoln movement. *Tribune* publisher Horace Greeley made it clear how he felt: "I can't trust your 'honest old Abe.' He is too smart for me." Greeley feared for the future of America in a protracted conflict. "During the next two years of war, the country, saddled with Lincoln, would be ravaged so that it would hardly be worth saving. But the Republican leaders had their backs up; he had talked with them; they would fight till Doomsday rather than consent to disunion. Every prominent Republican he had conversed with thought the only hope lay in defeating a re-election of Lincoln. Some suitable candidate should be at once decided upon."

Behind Greeley stood "Thaddeus Stevens, Senator [Benjamin F.] Wade, Henry Winter Davis, David Dudley Field, Governor [John] Andrew of Massachusetts and," according to a close associate of Greeley's "about all the more prominent Republican leaders."

When Greeley read the bitter news from Chancellorsville, where "130,000 magnificent soldiers [had been] cut to pieces by less than 60,000 half-starved ragamuffins," he was sure Lincoln was betraying the cause. Greeley insisted that the party leaders must get General William Rosecrans to run against Lincoln. To an emissary, he wrote: "If you find Rosecrans the man that is needed, I will go personally to Lincoln and force him to resign." Rosecrans was flattered by the offer to run but flatly turned it down, being convinced Lincoln was the right man in the right place.

In the winter of 1862-63, a quiet move was launched to impeach Lincoln. "There were Radical Republicans," notes Sandburg, "who wanted a man obedient to their wishes. There were reactionaries in both parties who hoped that the confusion of an impeachment would slow down the war, bring back *habeas corpus* and other civil rights. . . . They knew that in any final vote to impeach they could count on a large block of Ayes from the political opposition."

The success of the Confederacy gave rise to rumors that there was a Southern spy in the White House. The finger pointed at Mrs. Lincoln. A Congressional committee was appointed to investigate the matter. Hardly had the committee been called to order, when the doorkeeper announced a caller: the President of the United States, who had come uninvited and unawaited. All six feet four inches of the harassed Lincoln loomed over the committee as he solemnly intoned: "I, Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States, appear of my own volition before this Committee of the Senate to say that I, of my own knowledge, know that it is untrue that any of my family hold treasonable communication with the enemy." Having spoken, he turned and left.

In these days of despair, Lincoln frequently read Stillé's "How a Free People Conduct a Long War." The 40-page booklet, subtitled "A Chapter from English History," drew its "lessons" from a conflict vastly different from the Civil War: England's Peninsula War of 1807-12.

Fought not on native soil but in a far-away place, the Iberian Peninsula, the conflict was almost irrelevant to England's well-being, since its sole object was to repel Napoleon's aggression into Portugal and Spain. The war was geo-ideologic, an effort to contain the Napoleonic epidemic sweeping Europe.

At the outset, all "parties in Parliament and the country vied with each other in demanding that England should aid the [Iberian] insurrection with the whole of her military power." But with the very first failures, the mood changed. They "now spoke openly of the folly of any attempt of England to resist" Napoleon in the Peninsula. There was a mounting cry for unilateral withdrawal.

The ministry, however, "had sense enough to perceive that their only true policy was perseverance. They were strong enough to resist the formidable opposition . . . in Parliament and the country, and, undismayed by the experience of the past, concluded a treaty with the Provisional Government of Spain, by which they pledged England never to abandon the national cause until the French were driven across the Pyrenees."

The first year went very badly, largely because Wellington leaned on native troops. "Dependence upon the Spaniards was certainly, as it turned out, a fault . . . in which Wellington, made wise by experience, was never again detected." He anglicized the war.

Immediately, the "opposition in Parliament took advantage of this feeling to rouse public opinion to . . . compel the termination of the war in the Peninsula and drive the ministry from office." Weary of the badgering, the ministry "boldly challenged their opponents, if they were in earnest, to make a definite motion in the House of Commons, that Portugal should be abandoned to its fate. This move completely unmasked their game, and for a time silenced the clamor, for it was perfectly understood on all hands, that deep in the popular heart, undisturbed by the storms which swept over its surface, there was a thorough and abiding conviction of the absolute necessity of resisting the progress of Napoleon's arms, and that the real safety of England herself required that that resistance should then be made in Spain.

"Still this noisy clamor did immense mischief; it weakened the government, it prolonged the strife, it alarmed the timid, it discouraged the true, and it so far imposed upon Napoleon himself that, thinking that in these angry invectives against the government he found the real exponent of English sentiment, he concluded, not unnaturally, that the people were tired and disgusted with the war, and that the privations which it occasioned were like a cancer, slowly but surely eating out the sources of national life."

It took three long years for Wellington to clean out Portugal and reach the Spanish frontiers, where he set up a holding operation. "People talked of 'barren victories,' because [the battles] brought no territorial acquisitions." Said Sir Francis Burdett: "No man in his senses could entertain a hope of the final success of our arms in the Peninsula. Our laurels were great, but barren, and our victories in their effects mere defeat." General Tarleton "wished for the pencil of a Cervantes to be able to ridicule those who desired to enter upon a continental war."

"The following description of the opposition of that day," wrote Stillé in 1862, "bears so striking a likeness to the peculiarities of the leaders of an insignificant but restless faction among us, that omitting the old-fashioned drapery of the proper names, they seem to have sat for the photograph." Stillé then quoted the annual Register for 1812.

"Those persons in this country who profess to have the greatest abhorrence of ministerial tyranny and oppression, look with the utmost coolness on the tyranny and oppression of Bonaparte. . . . They are almost always ready to find an excuse for the conduct of Bonaparte. The most violent and unjustifiable acts of his tyranny raise but feeble indignation in their minds, while the most trifling act of ministerial oppression is inveighed against with the utmost bitterness."

"There is such a thing as public opinion, falsely so called," concluded Stillé, "which is noisy just in proportion as its real influence is narrow and restricted. One of the most difficult and delicate tasks of the statesman is to distinguish the true from the false opinion, the factious demagogue from the grumbling but sincere patriot, and to recognize with a ready instinct the voice which comes from the depths of the great heart of the people, in warning it may be some times, in encouragement, often, but always echoing

its abiding faith in the ultimate triumph of the good cause."

"The only possible hope for the South," ended Stillé in a return to the Civil War, "is in our own divisions."

On this note Lincoln concluded his reading on the Peninsula War to Senator Brown. Although the account dealt with another time when a great power sent troops to a far-away land to contain a hostile and aggressive ideology backed by a dedicated army, Lincoln found its "lessons" somehow relevant for his time.

Maybe he needed them to renew his courage. Someone had taken a shot at the President while he was riding in the woods. Thereafter he began to watch his personal movements more carefully.

Student Reporters in Vietnam

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, once again I am reprinting in the RECORD articles on Vietnam written by student reporters from Queens College who are now reporting their on-the-scene views of the tragic and brutal war there.

The dispatches of Lee Dembart and Ralph Paladino have been of consistently high quality. Their latest reports describe in painfully clear detail the current agony in Khe Sanh, as well as the less dramatic, though equally appalling situations in Chu Lai.

The articles follow:

(By Lee Dembart)

DANANG.—"These were just American boys. They did not want that valley or any part of its jungle. They were ex-grocery clerks, or ex-highway laborers, ex-bank clerks, ex-schoolboys, boys with a clean record and maybe a little extra restlessness, but not killers.

"They had volunteered; they had come into the Marines with their eyes open. Yes, but they had joined the Marines to see the world, or to get away from a guilt, or most likely to escape the draft, not knowingly to kill or be killed."

So wrote John Hersey 25 years ago in his story of a World War II patrol, *Into the Valley*. He could have been describing today's Marines.

More than half of all American combat troops in Vietnam are here in I Corps, comprising the five northernmost provinces of the country. It is here that a guerrilla war is fast becoming a conventional war as two armies face each other, and it is here that American military leaders expect the Big Battle to be fought.

I approached I Corps, or Marineland as it is sometimes called, with trepidation. Surely I would have trouble talking with these Marines, hardened on Parris Island, taught to kill, imbued with a hatred that was to last them through a year's battles in Vietnam.

"You'd better get your hair cut before you go up north," I had been told in Saigon. "The Marines, they don't like guys with long hair." I dutifully got my hair cut.

"—," said the Marine corporal in Phu Bai when I told him about my haircut. "We'd love to see a guy with longer hair; would make him look like a civilian."

It was the beginning of my awakening. "Just between you and me," a Marine sergeant told me after we had split a chicken-and-noodles C ration, "there's no reason for

us being here. I can't see it. A lot of the men can't see it. This is the gook's war and it shouldn't make a ——— of difference to us who wins."

They want to know everything about the States, the land of the great PX. Had I heard the new Beatles album? What were all the students going to do about the new draft rules? Is it true that everybody is smoking pots? What is Bobby Kennedy up to?

Cards are the great pastime. Not poker, but hearts. And they pass the queen of spades off on each other with a flourish, a smile, and a friendly dig.

Some have kind words for the Marine Corps. Others would rather be out than in. All express contempt for "lifers," the not-too-endearing term for career military men.

What is most astonishing is that in or out of uniform, it is impossible to distinguish the Marines from any group of 20-year-olds in the States. Only when they pick up the M-16 and scan the road ahead for VC do they look or talk or act distinctively.

It is much easier to condemn them from the States than to condemn them from here. The various draft-dodging ploys were unknown or unopen, pressure from family to "make something of yourself" built up, political concerns never existed, so they joined the Marines.

"What a jerk I was to get involved in this crap," said one private. "Sure, I had to get away, but now all I want to do is get back and get to school and learn to do something."

The sentiment was echoed by others. "Never should have quit high school," a corporal lamented. Should have stuck around and moved to the Village and had a grand time and let some other sucker come over here to get his ——— shot at."

The intensity of last month's fighting, especially around Hue, has turned some of the Marines somber. "Sometimes I look at them zipping up 18- and 19-year-old guys in body bags, and I wonder what in hell we're doing here," a sergeant thought aloud, gazing into a warm glass of beer. "Other times it just makes me so mad I want to go out and kill every lousy Commie around."

They are a complex breed and any attempt to characterize them falls flat. That's just the point. The remarks quoted here are far from hypocritical, but they were said, and they were said with that puzzled conviction that marks a man who has just discovered a world he never before knew existed.

There are many who are straight out of the Westbrook Pegler school. Others know little and care less, love to fight, and make up the standard collegiate view of the Marine Corps.

Most are the proverbial "average guy," burying petty and not-so-petty annoyances at the scowl of society and the demand to fit in.

The vast majority at least say they are interested in finding out why Stateside protesters are protesting. They call them names, but they don't dismiss them.

Within those broad outlines is found every kind of human being from apple-polishing valedictorian to acid head. "I became an Existentialist a number of years ago," said a 40-year-old sergeant who reenlisted last year after a long stint out of the Corps. "I do all the protesting I want, but I don't tell anybody about it."

"That's the trouble with you kids. You think it's not real protest, real sacrifice, unless you go and tell everybody ywhat you're doing."

"You know," said another, awarded a purple heart after being shot through the arm and chest three months ago, "even when you're in contact with the enemy and all hell is breaking loose, you figure, 'hell, no bullet can hit me'."

"But, Christ! That time I heard six shots and felt pain and started throwing up my guts."

They don't talk of their dead or of anybody's dead. Sometimes they will tell you of how they narrowly escaped death themselves, or of who was killed in their place, but they never dwell on the subject. No "he was a great guy" routine. No Ensigns Pulver mourn the deaths of Ministers Roberts.

Cruelty may be the way of war, but cruelty is not the way of their lives. One soldier says the only person in the world he hates is his commanding officer, and that's because last week he suggested he cancel his subscription to *The Evergreen Review*.

It used to be a lot easier to tell the good guys from the bad guys, the war profiteers from honest men, sincerity from sham.

What is becoming increasingly clear is that no one deserves to be judged guilty and no one deserves to be judged guiltless. We are all in this thing together.

(By Lee Dembart)

HUE, SOUTH VIETNAM.—It used to be a beautiful city, untouched by the war, living in a dream and believing it would never be awakened.

Tree-lined streets and parks and gardens set the tone. It its hub, just off the Perfume River rolling listlessly through the center of town, the Citadel, ancient Imperial capital of a never-to-be-recaptured Vietnam.

Now all that is left is the chirping of the birds, and even they are scarce. Every house, every building, every shack, every tree shows signs of the three-week struggle that made Hue just one more battlefield in a country of battlefields.

Inside the battered walls of the Citadel, broken glass reflects the sun in a kaleidoscope of colors and brightness. It crackles underfoot with every step, and sticks in your boots and clothing.

In the museum next to the Imperial Palace, shattered display bases are the only remnants of Oriental art that dated back to the 6th Century. Only the objects too large and cumbersome to carry away have been left behind.

The museum's curator, a small man with a jungle hat and a powder blue suit and a vest, reluctantly unlocks the gate to allow a visitor to walk through the building. Bullet shells are on the floor, covering the cards that once identified the objects on display.

He opens empty boxes to show that the silver and gold pieces they once contained are now gone. Broken silvers of Hue blue, a distinctive 500-year-old ceramic style, litter the area. A small teacup of Hue blue used to sell in Saigon for \$40. Now there is a blot on the market. There isn't a piece intact throughout the museum.

The curator is asked who ransacked the place. He will say only that three armies occupied the building at one time or another, and he doesn't know who took what. Half-eaten and empty cans of American C rations are strewn along the floor.

There are few objects left. Two large flower vases, two and a half feet high and two feet in diameter, stand beside the wall. One has been moved several feet, but it was too large to walk off with easily. A throne chair with satin curtains and four gold handles occupies the center of the room. On a table rests the guest book, thick with names, testifying to the one-time popularity of the museum.

Outside, thick trenches along the Citadel walls attest to the tenacity of the Vietcong defense. A slipper lies beside one trench, its owner either dead or escaped. ARVN soldiers stop and inspect every Vietnamese coming into the Citadel, some several times. The fortress was too hard in winning to be given away.

A visitor wanders through the city, amidst the rubble, past fresh graves, across a pontoon bridge, and his mind returns again to the empty museum. It was not a victim of battle; it was a victim of greed.

American Marines say some of the treasures

wound up in their barracks, brought there by fellow Corpsmen returning from the Citadel. Most blame the Vietnamese soldiers, a group that has amassed a reputation for looting since the Tet assault. Some hold the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese responsible.

Odd that in a city that has suffered so greatly one small item, one semicolon, should stand out so much.

Perhaps it is because in the midst of all the Allied claims that the destruction could not be avoided, here was something that could have been avoided.

(By Ralph Paladino)

KHESANH, SOUTH VIETNAM.—There is no longer a Khesanh in Vietnam. The city is only a flattened ruin under which lies the command post from which the North Vietnamese commander will direct the attack on the Marine installation which has adopted its name—if indeed such an attack ever comes.

Once a popular vacation area on a regular aircraft run from other parts of Vietnam, there are no vacationers at Khesanh now, and few planes land here. The World War II C-123, which is the only fixed-wing aircraft flying into the base, has been modified with two additional jet engines for rapid climb in the face of enemy fire. On its second run the day of this writing, one plane carried cargo destined for Khesanh, ammunition, radios, and weapons, as well as a pallet of three-week-old mail.

We are jocular at first, five civilian reporters, a Marine going to his assignment, the three man crew. As we approach the base, a tenseness replaces the feeble humor of a few minutes earlier. We know that small arms fire can pierce the thin hull and us, that mortars and rocket fire will be our greeting. We also can still remember the sixteen bodies that had been unloaded from this plane in its first return from Khesanh that day.

The instructions are simple: wait for the cargo to unload, then run out the back after it, turn left, and jump into the nearest ditch. Wait until the plane is long gone before venturing out. Only an idiot could get the directions wrong; a fellow with us ends up with shrapnel in his buttocks and legs.

The plane does not stop, but lands in a dive, taxis, jettisons its cargo as it turns, its passengers as it begins its takeoff, and continues on its way as returnees scurry aboard. Only then do the mortars begin to fall. The plane is safe.

Khesanh is brown; brown dirt, brown tents, brown sandbags. Little is left intact above ground, buildings with sides ripped off, tents with holes, the sides of bunkers, the air tower, supplies. The weather is cool and misty, the mountains obscured by the low, heavy clouds. But the clouds and mist are a blessing in some ways, for they provide cover necessary to move across the base.

There are no interlocking trenches at Khesanh. One continuous, circular trench rings the perimeter. To go from any point to nearly any other, one must move across the open ground. In the fog it is possible to move leisurely and upright. When the fog lifts, one crouches, jumping hurriedly from cover to cover.

We run to the press office, a ditch with a metal cover and two layers of sandbags. After a quick briefing, we split up to seek lodging for the night. The Navy Seabees' bunker near the flightline has become the unofficial press center because it is the deepest and strongest on the base. They do not resent constant intrusion, if only because the nights are long and dull.

The fog has begun to lift. I move quickly to the perimeter and jump with relief into the artillery bunkers. Live ammunition is piled to one side, protected only by a thin layer of wood and sand. With the lifting fog, the air war goes into high gear, but little of it can be seen on this side of the ridges, where the fog still hangs.

A Marine Sergeant answers my questions, most of them unspoken. "It's tough, man. We keep waiting for them to attack and they never do. Mostly you're not scared, just bored. Until someone gets hit with the 105 (mm.) like our neighbor next door did. Then you figure, man, one of those things could land on you next. No one was killed, but they could have been. I was talking to a brother [the Sergeant is black] who was hit bad, and it just makes you want to go out and kill them with your bare hands. I wish they'd attack and get it over with." We talk a little longer about his wife and a child he has not yet seen. He invites me to come back when the fog lifts further to watch the air strikes.

It is the pressure that is most noticeable, the sense of waiting, of impermanence all around. The base is strewn with garbage, broken planes and helicopters, shelled jeeps and trucks, litter from the hundreds of holes in the ground the men must live in.

Khesanh is ringed by barbed wire, a mine field, more barbed wire, a field of electronically-set off claymore mines, more barbed wire, a ring of ARVN marines, more barbed wire, the American perimeter, barbed wire, and then the artillery on the inside. The North Vietnamese troops cross the minefield, tunnel under the barbed wire, steal the claymores or turn them around, and splice their own wires onto them. As often as not they die in the process.

The fog has lifted. An ARVN private leads me through the claymore field to the wire. On the other side, six bodies lie in the center of the minefield. No one will venture in to remove them. "They don't smell this far away," he says in proper English. I begin to stand to see into the deep grass. A shot rings out. We don't know if it is aimed at us or not, but we jump instinctively into a nearby hole.

Later we crouch to a further part of the perimeter. In the near distance we can see a Marine patrol checking out a trench where bodies were seen during the night, killed by an exploding artillery shell. We hastily join them. The bodies are gone, removed by their comrades before dawn when the flares had died. Bits and pieces, though, lie behind, covered with dirt, red showing through, to attest that indeed some men died here. We return to the lines.

As I approach the air strip, a C-123 begins its ascent.

A mortar lands behind it. The plane, 20 feet off the ground, begins to lean to the right, the end of its wing scraping along the ground. The wing crumbles, then tears, the plane swerves into the soft dirt on the side of the strip. The engines burst into flame. People begin to scurry out of the small emergency exits, cutting their arms and legs on the sharp edges. The fire-trucks, those that have not been destroyed, arrive quickly and begin to pour chemical fire suppressors on the flames. Spectators begin to congregate.

There are a few wounded from the plane, none seriously. It takes a long time for the enemy to notice what has happened, but eventually artillery begins to fall. One shell lands near an ambulance. Men fall to the ground, and it takes a few moments to sort out those who fell instinctively and those who fell wounded. The shelling stops and the injured are carried away. The plane sits on its side, its broken wing in the air, between two other aircraft that met similar fates. Soon there will not be enough room on the side of the runway for any more accidents.

A dead NVA soldier is brought into the graves section. He was killed in the early morning inside the perimeter. The wound is small and hardly noticeable, a slight bulging of the eye, a hole only slightly larger than the pupil should have been the only indication of damage. A private in a tee shirt is called out of his bunker. He lifts up the corpse's head by the hair. "Come on, get up

will ya." He bounces the head a few times on the bed of a truck and repeats himself, "come on, get up, it ain't siesta time yet."

The private looks disgustedly over to me. "Now I've got to bury the son of a bitch." He pulls the body until it falls face down on the brown dirt, takes a large canvas bag, and, with help, stuffs the body into it. The bag has a succinct, complete description of its contents on its side: "Dead."

It is not pleasant to be a Marine at Khesanh today. Most have not had a shower facility in five weeks. Water is in too short supply to be wasted, or is too far away. The men's clothes are brown as are their faces. The wind blows a constant, fine dust that covers everything; their skin, hair, clothes, the floor, the bed, everything. The bunks are damp, and since there are few generators working now, mostly dark. There is little variety in C-rations, but they have been eating them three meals a day for six weeks, cooked in pierced cans over heat tabs. There is little to do once the work is done.

There are incongruities here also. The Navy Seabees, whose primary job is to maintain the air strip, have by default also become the base electricians and mechanics. They have the only shower left, complete with hot water, patched together after each attack. They have the only washing machines left, made from pieces of dozens of others destroyed in the attacks.

The Seabees have one of few generators left. Made to run an electric saw, it now provides power to the camp headquarters as well as to the Seabee's bunks. The PX still operates, though irregularly and with little to sell. There are enough stewed prunes in stock to last forever.

What will happen to Khesanh? Six thousand Marines, sailors, and soldiers lay surrounded by two enemy divisions, twelve thousand to 14,000 men. Sometime soon the Viet Cong must decide whether to attack or fade away. If the NVA can overrun Khesanh it will be considered a significant defeat for the Allied forces. Perhaps the North's leaders believe that like the French the United States will grow weary of the war and go home, that America will agree to negotiate from weakness. But the troops here now are not the French, and if the North's leaders have not come to this realization of themselves, the Russians surely have told them. A defeat here for the Allies would only result in a widening of the destruction of the North by US airpower.

And if the NVA does not overrun Khesanh, it will be a clear defeat, one that no amount of propaganda will be able to mitigate. Heads will roll in the North.

Khesanh is not well dug in. Perhaps the Marines do not believe in it. The air strip is very vulnerable. The entire US strategy depends on air support and the power of big guns.

Could Khesanh be taken? The troops think not. They are confident they can throw back anything the NVA can pour at them. But privately their officers are not so sure. A Lieut. Colonel put it this way: "If the NVA is willing to pay the price, they could take Khesanh. It would be as expensive as hell, but they could take it."

A company commander added this: "Three days of bad weather in a row and we would lose Khesanh. We have to have the air support. It all depends on the weather."

A plane lands quickly in the late afternoon. The weather has not cleared, but the plane can wait no longer. Mortar rounds had earlier hit the turning pad, but for the moment it is quiet. The waiting passengers crouch in a nearby ditch until the plane is sighted, then quickly move closer, hiding behind abandoned vehicles and cargo not yet picked up. Mortars begin to rain down, the plane opens its huge tail, the cargo slides out, and we rush in the open rear. The plane is already on its way as we struggle to strap

ourselves in. It spent less than three minutes under fire. The Marines have spent 52 days.

(By Ralph Paladino)

CHU LAI.—Certain subjects are not discussed in Vietnam. The people would not understand, they would misinterpret, world opinion would be unfavorable, and it is easier to ignore the people than explain facts to them. The existence of American-run detention camps for Vietnamese is one of these subjects.

Ask any Information Officer from Saigon to the demilitarized zone if the American Army runs camps for Vietnamese civilians for any reason, and he will tell you that only the Vietnamese government runs such places. Ask him about Prisoner-of-War camps, and his answer will be that only the Vietnamese government runs them. Find one that has heard of either of the two types of camps, and he will be unable to explain their purpose or say where any are located. In simple fact, they are not lying. They just don't know.

One such camp exists at the Americal Division Headquarters in Chu Lai. It is not a very large affair, a few large open huts, a shower, latrines, a kitchen, and six small interrogation booths. The entire compound is surrounded by high, barbed-wire fences and armed guards. It is a highly restricted area, no visitors allowed, no photographs, no reporters.

It takes a great deal of time to break through the considerable barriers which surround the camp, red tape and permissions no less formidable than its guards and fences. Only the two-star Division Commander can reverse the refusals at all other levels of military hierarchy. He is difficult to persuade, dubious at the least, but permission is granted.

The requirements remain: no interviews with guards or detainees, no photographs, and no access to the separate PW compound that makes up a part of the camp. A Lieut. Colonel conducts the tour.

There are only eight inmates in the compound, two of whom are prisoners of war who will be turned over to the South Vietnamese government. The South Vietnamese PW camps have been penetrated only once by news media. The Red Cross, however, has not protested treatment or conditions in them, and apparently the Geneva Conventions are rigidly adhered to. The other six inmates are in the process of interrogation.

After interrogation they will be categorized as either innocent civilians (IC), prisoners of war (PW), or civilian defendants (CD). Their fate depends on their final designation. If they are innocent civilians, they will be returned as quickly as possible to their home villages or to their point of capture. It is seldom a long process. Most of these people will be returned to their homes within 24 hours of being picked up. Few will remain in the camp over 48 hours.

PW's, on the other hand, face an extended stay in American hands while Intelligence conducts a full interrogation. These prisoners are immediately separated and placed into the nearby PW compound.

The last category, CD's, include paramilitary types, terrorists, and VC supporters.

Traditionally, it has been easy to determine the difference between those enemy men who fell in the categories covered by the Geneva Convention and those that did not. A uniformed soldier was a PW, a non-uniformed one a spy or terrorist. But this war is different. What is a guerrilla in his black pajamas, a Viet Cong wearing a red armband, a uniformed terrorist? The American interrogators must decide, for CD's are turned over to the Vietnamese government for criminal trial, and may be hanged or shot.

If not luxurious, the camp's facilities are adequate to the needs of the detainees. Prisoners share a hut which provides sufficient shelter from the sun and rain. Jerry cans of water sit in the shade. There is no floor and no furnishings. Each hut is separated from each other by a fence and barbed wire. Two sheets of paper are posted on the wall of each hut with some simple translations and some blunt warnings.

The warnings tell the prisoners that those who attempt to escape will be shot, no talking between huts, no exchanging things between huts, and in case of riots, gas will be used. If the prisoner needs something and no one who speaks Vietnamese is available to translate, he can simply read the English from the second list (assuming he can read), "I have something to tell you," and then, "I need an interpreter," or "I need to use the latrine," or "I am sick and need a doctor," or "We are out of water."

The detainees keep their own areas clean, cook their own food, and do odd jobs around the compound. There is a shower which they can use during certain times of the day, an indoor latrine that they must be taught how to use (otherwise they will stand on it and squat instead of sitting). There is a kitchen in which selected prisoners cook the camp's meals of rice and shrimp or chicken. There is a supply room from which they are issued soap, candy, pajamas, and cigarettes. In the evening they are issued a cot and a blanket which will be taken away at 5 a.m. the next morning, unless they are ill.

There is little opportunity for the prisoners to be mistreated. Thirty military police guard the compound, and in fact live next to it. A separate Military Intelligence unit conducts the interrogations. The six interrogation huts are lighted and have only half walls. An MP views the procedures from a guard tower, with instructions to notify his commander if he hears verbal abuse or sees evidence of physical abuse.

The interrogations are low keyed, even friendly. The prisoners are usually very young, hardly more than 16 years old, and do not seem to be fighting the interrogators verbally.

During the five-day Tet offensive, 279 Vietnamese were processed in the collection center. Most were picked up in enemy-held villages after a battle, or in sweeps of areas from which mortar and rocket fire came. Out of the 279, 33 were designated CD's and turned over to police authorities, 27 were declared PW's, and after interrogation were transported to one of the Prisoner of War camps operated by the Vietnamese army, and 219 were found to be innocent civilians, and were returned home. The average stay at the camp was four days. The average stay for innocent civilians was just under two days.

The camps stand as one of the less comfortable aspects of the war. Innocent people caught in the crossfire between two enemies find themselves taken at the point of a gun far from home. Often their wives and families will be unaware of their plight. The farmers do not understand where they are going or when they will be home again. They will be treated correctly, but probably not kindly by an alien people. But within the confines of the situation the field commander is faced with, there seems to be few alternatives to the continued existence of the camps, and they are, for the moment, a necessary evil.

(By Ralph Paladino)

CHU LAI.—With the military the most prominent American presence in Vietnam, it was inevitable that the responsibility for distributing a large part of the total American aid budget should fall to it. Anyone familiar with military manners and ways will recall the peculiar military propensity for becoming

over-enthusiastic about nearly everything it does. Any questioning of United States Army Aid Officers concerning the scope or effectiveness of the U.S. aid program results in what must be a preplanned recital of statistics, complete with necessary charts and graphs, that would dazzle any computer.

The Army has three sources for aid funds and materials: division funds allocated expressly for aid purposes (and which probably form a padding somewhere in the defense budget); aid resources provided by the many private and public agencies operating in Vietnam; and private sources of various types, such as company and unit funds, donations, and captured enemy materiel.

Division funds vary from unit to unit, but generally fall somewhere in the vicinity of 200,000 piastres (\$1,700) per month. Added to this is a large amount of surplus material, scrap wood and metal, mess hall food declared unfit for human consumption by veterinary officers (such food is seldom actually unfit for eating), and anything that can be scrounged or stolen by enterprising aid section (G-5) officers.

Aid resources from the various agencies, as well as those provided by the South Vietnamese government, are distributed by the military in cases of large-scale emergencies which make rapid and efficient distribution essential, and in areas which are definitely unsafe for unarmed aid teams.

Funds raised through troop donations play a large part in the military aid program, often equalling allocated funds for the purpose. Most units maintain a running campaign for carrying out their own projects, such as supporting a particular school, hospital, or orphanage, or for addition to the division fund. There is little question of the existence of a great amount of sheer generosity among the soldiers in Vietnam.

But, when one has to be generous, it is always more satisfying to be generous with someone else's supplies. All resource, rice, corn, and livestock found in areas considered to be totally under Viet Cong control, are transported to military warehouses for future distribution in friendly areas. In cases where a food cache cannot immediately be moved, it is usually destroyed, but not before such destruction is personally approved by the Division Commander. The Americal Division alone captured over one million . . . rice in an eight-month period.

At one time, stores were distributed through local government channels either at the district or province level. Now only the approval of the particular level of government is sought. The stores do not leave Army hands until their actual distribution takes place. The official reason for this change in policy is greater efficiency, but a few candid officers who were stationed in Vietnam before the change will admit other motives; it is the only way that the Army can be sure that needed stores won't be sold to the people or stolen.

This seemingly justifiable fear of letting anything out of sight permeates the methods by which all supplies are distributed. Cement and sheet tin are only given in daily usable quantities, and that quantity is carefully computed beforehand. If more than a one day supply is delivered at one time, it would likely be gone on the second day.

The Tet offensive has reduced the scope of the Army's future plans, although nowhere near as drastically as the pacification and rural development programs in general. The greatest effort for the near future must go into rebuilding a large percentage of the completed projects that were destroyed by the Viet Cong, who exercised great selectivity in most villages, only demolishing schools, marketplaces, and wells that were built with American help or material.

The school in the village of Khuong-Nhon, for instance, was blown up for the third time. Only one wall still stands, but the local

teacher, threatened with death if he continued to teach, still conducts his classes, now in a temporary shelter. He has, however, prudently moved out of the village to a home immediately adjacent to the Army installation.

Often it is difficult to determine whether a particular officer is simply distorting the truth, or whether there is a simple lack of communication between the local Vietnamese officials and their military counterparts. Dozens of new villages have sprung up in "pacified" areas as a result of VC harassment. The villagers, along with all their possessions, have been moved by the Army from VC-controlled areas and resettled where some degree of protection and control can be afforded. The local District Chief, his American advisor, and the Americal Division Commander insist that the moves were completely voluntary.

American soldiers in the process of moving villagers from one area to another have strict orders not to take anyone against his will. Undoubtedly no one is lifted, kicking and screaming, into waiting trucks and helicopters.

It is no easy task to get an opinion of American or GVN policies from local villagers. They are frightened that anything they say will be reported to local officials and that reprisals will be taken against them. A direct question is doomed to a foggy answer. Through an interpreter, however, dozens of residents of the newly resettled villages of Son-Tra and Khuong-Nhon expressed dissatisfaction with their new homes. Alternately they expressed the fact that they had moved voluntarily and they had been forced to move. In a sense, at least, both statements are simultaneously true.

The villagers were told by the GVN that the territory in which they were living was to be declared a free-fire zone, and that they would be killed either by VC or friendly attacks if they did not move. Voluntarily, and to escape what must have sounded like imminent death, they moved.

They are content in their new homes, or so they say. But the condition of the land makes that most unlikely. Khuong-Nhon is a village of sand, the land useless for anything but growing potatoes and miraculously a few tomatoes, squash, and tobacco. Rice will not grow. The farmers will readily admit that their old land was far superior, and some complain of the difficulty of making a living in their new homes. But asked if they are happy in the new location, they always answer a definite yes.

The Army now finds itself doing a job for which it was not designed. It has become in many cases a servant to GVN policies, expected to carry out those policies regardless of its own feelings on the subject. Aid is sporadic and dependent many times on the whims and interest of the particular Division Commander at the time. Communication with the Vietnamese people is often non-existent, reports are glowingly optimistic, the results often non-apparent. With all these disadvantages, however, it is the Army which still stands as the only effective agency for the distribution of large-scale aid in the aftermath of the Tet offensive.

The "Pueblo": How Long, Mr. President?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, this is the 57th day the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and her crew have been in North Korean hands.

The Census, Religion, and the Right of Privacy

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, in recent months I have received several inquiries relating to the proper scope of questions on the 1970 Decennial Census, with particular emphasis on invasion of privacy and religious freedom.

The Congress should address itself to the subject of protection of the right of privacy in the census as well as on other Government questionnaires. Failure to respond to the census questionnaire carries with it penalties of fines and imprisonment.

The appropriate committees of the Congress should not only review the propriety of the proposed 1970 census questionnaire form, but if necessary should enact legislation dividing the questionnaire into two categories—the first category to include questions on population, which would be mandatory, and the second a limited category of general questions, response to which would be optional.

Mr. Speaker, the right of privacy is constitutionally protected. This right should not be tampered with, nor should this right be invaded and subject to the whims of those who draft questions for the census. Some of the questions proposed for the 1970 census constitute invasions of privacy and the response to such questions should be optional:

"Do you share your shower?"

"How many babies have you ever had?"

"What is your rent?"

These are questions of a personal nature and failure to answer them should not be punishable by fines and imprisonment.

The very length of the 1970 census form—with more than 70 subject items—is an invasion of privacy. Many persons will have difficulty completing the form and many will fail to return the questionnaire. Such a situation will have a bearing on the accuracy of the census and may seriously affect statistics upon which to base Federal grant programs and congressional redistricting. That is why this subject deserves the attention of Congress.

The difficulty in answering the census questionnaire will be even more apparent in low income and disadvantaged areas—the inner cities where statistics are most important. The very length and detail of the census will defeat its main purpose.

As to the inquiries I have received about the possibility of the census including questions on religion, I had a conference with Dr. Conrad Taeuber, Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Census, who informed me about the present policy on the subject. Dr. Taeuber said that the press release issued by the Department of Commerce on November 16, 1966, states the present policy of the Census Bureau on the matter of asking questions about religion in the census.

For the information of my colleagues in the House, I am including in the RECORD the full text of the Department of Commerce press release of November 16, 1966:

THE 1970 CENSUS WILL NOT CONTAIN
QUESTION ON RELIGION

The 1970 Census of Population, following past precedents, will not include a question on religion. A. Ross Eckler, Director of the Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce, announced today.

The Bureau has been considering a number of requests from individuals and organizations which proposed that a question on religion be added to the nationwide census which is to be taken beginning in April 1970. The decision not to add this question is based on the fact that a substantial number of persons again expressed an extremely strong belief that asking such a question in the Decennial Population Census, in which replies are mandatory, would infringe upon the traditional separation of church and State.

Persons who proposed the religious question stressed the importance of religion in many aspects of American life and called attention to the fact that such a question is included in a number of national censuses, including those of Canada and Australia. Similar reasons both for and against were presented during the planning of the Censuses of 1950 and 1960.

The issues again were widely discussed at a series of public meetings held in all parts of the country and were also reviewed in recent hearings before the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the House of Representatives. Since there appears to be no basic change in the nature of the arguments pro and con, there seems to be no reason to delay the decision.

The Director of the Census called attention to the fact that some of the needs for data might sometime be met in a manner that is open to fewer objections, by including an inquiry on religious affiliation or preference in one of the sample surveys conducted by the Census Bureau. In such a survey, response would be voluntary.

Mr. Speaker, I am also placing in the RECORD at this point an interesting speech delivered by Dr. Taeuber entitled "The Census and a Question on Religion" delivered at a conference sponsored by the Synagogue Council of America, the National Community Advisory Council, and the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, in New York City, October 23, 1967:

THE CENSUS AND A QUESTION ON RELIGION
(By Conrad Taeuber, Assistant Director,
Bureau of the Census)

The Constitution of the United States calls for an enumeration of the population to be taken within three years of the adoption of that instrument and within every subsequent term of ten years. The initial count was required to show the respective numbers for apportionment of the representation in the House of Representatives. The totals were to be secured by "... adding to the whole number of free persons, including those bound to service for a term of years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three-fifths of all other persons."

In taking the Census of 1790 it was necessary, therefore, to distinguish between slave and free persons. The Act providing for the census also required the Marshals to distinguish the sex and color of free persons and to establish the number of free males 16 years of age and over. Presumably this latter provision was intended to give a measure of the military and industrial strength of the country.

Some persons had urged that the count of the population should provide additional in-

formation which the newly independent country needed, but the final decision was to limit the enumeration to the subjects listed.

In the debates on the inclusion of items in the census, which were not specifically required for the purposes of apportionment, James Madison dealt with a number of objections. When it was observed that the additional items might create alarm on the part of some persons who would be suspicious of the government's intentions in this matter, Madison replied that he: "... thought it was more likely that the people would suppose the information was required for its true object, namely, to know in what proportion to distribute the benefits resulting from an efficient General Government."¹

In 1800, when the Congress was considering the provisions for the Census of 1800, they received a memorial from the American Philosophical Society, signed by its president, Thomas Jefferson. By virtue of his position as Secretary of State, Jefferson had served as director of the Census of 1790. The memorial said that it considered the new census of the United States "... as offering an occasion of great value, and not otherwise to be obtained, of ascertaining sundry facts highly important to the society."² The memorial urged that the population be classified according to age for the purpose of calculating the duration of life, the chances of life, and the rate of increase in the population in the several age groups.

They suggested that the age groups include: "births, two, five, ten, sixteen, twenty-one, twenty-five years and every term of 5 years thence to one hundred." The population was also to be divided into native citizens, citizens of foreign births and aliens. In addition, they suggested that free male inhabitants of all ages be classified by occupation: "... under the following or such other descriptions as the greater wisdom of the legislature shall approve, to wit: 1st, men of the learned professions, including clergymen, lawyers, physicians, those employed in the fine arts, teachers and scribes in general; 2d, merchants and trades, including bankers, insurers, brokers, and dealers of every kind; 3d, marines; 4th, handicraftsmen; 5th, laborers in agriculture; 6th, laborers of other descriptions; 7th, domestic servants; 8th, paupers; 9th, persons of no particular calling, living on their income; care being taken that every person be noted but once in the table, and that under the description to which he principally belongs."³

Another memorial, from the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences was signed by Timothy Dwight, its president. It stated: "... that to present and future generations it will be highly gratifying to observe the progress of population in this country, and to be able to trace the proportion of its increase from native Americans and from foreigners immigrating at successive periods; to observe the progress or decline of various occupations; the effects of population, luxury, mechanic arts, the cultivation of lands, and the draining of marshes on the health and longevity of the citizens of the United States."⁴

To accomplish these purposes they recommended that the next census should classify the population by age and sex, by whether born in this country or abroad, and by occupation, and that account be taken of the number of married persons and of unmarried

persons above 30 years of age, and of widows and widowers.

Apparently the Congress was not impressed with the need "to furnish a curious and useful document of the distribution of society in these States, and of the conditions and vocations of our fellow citizens. . . ." There is no record of any discussion of these memorials in the Senate. The Census of 1800 called for the same items of information as that of 1790, but it increased the age categories which were to be used and specified that they were to be applied to free white males and females.

Although the population items included in the Census of 1810 were to be the same as those in the Census of 1800, the Congress directed that there be a supplemental inquiry which would give an "... account of the several manufacturing establishments and manufacturers within their several districts, territories and divisions." This inquiry was the forerunner of what today is a quinquennial census of manufactures.⁵

In subsequent years the Congress was more ready to secure needed information through the periodic enumeration of the population. The methods used changed and gradually evolved to those which are the hallmarks of a modern census. The subjects to be included changed from time to time, depending on the needs of the country. Some questions were added, others were dropped when the need no longer existed, when other sources of information became available, or when it had been ascertained that the census was not a suitable means of securing reliable information about a given topic.

Other periodic censuses were added from time to time. The Quinquennial Census of Agriculture is the modern-day successor to some questions on agriculture which were first asked in connection with the Census of 1840. A Census of Housing was instituted in 1940 to be taken in conjunction with the Census of Population. A Quinquennial Census of Business is the present-day successor to a census first taken for 1929. A Quinquennial Census of Governments is the modern version of a census which was begun in 1850.

Among the other censuses are Irrigation and Drainage (taken every ten years with the Census of Agriculture), Mineral Industries, and Transportation.

The Bureau is directed to take each of these censuses. The Census Act lists one other census which is not required, but "may" be taken, namely the Census of Religious Bodies. From 1850 to 1890 the Bureau of the Census had asked in connection with the Census of Population for information concerning the recorded membership of local churches, value of edifices, and number of clergymen. In 1906 it began the conduct of a separate Census of Religious Bodies by means of a questionnaire which was mailed to the pastors and clerks of the parishes or congregations. This was repeated at 10-year intervals through 1936. A similar census was begun in 1946 but the Congress denied the funds needed for its completion. The Administration did not request funds for such censuses in 1956 and 1966 and there was no Congressional drive to have such censuses taken.⁶

The Census of Religious Bodies did not supply information on the social and economic characteristics of the members of the several religious groups. Such information is considered important by a number of social scientists, by representatives of some religious organizations and by other persons. Interested persons have for some time

¹ Dorothy S. Thomas, "Prefatory Note," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, Volume 111, Number 3, June 22, 1967, p. 134.

² Dorothy S. Thomas, *Ibid.*, p. 133.

³ Dorothy S. Thomas, *Op. Cit.*, p. 133.

⁴ Carroll D. Wright and William C. Hunt, *History and Growth of the United States Census, 1790-1890*, Washington, D.C., 1900, p. 19.

⁵ Carroll D. Wright and William C. Hunt, *Op. Cit.*, p. 22.

⁶ Benson Y. Landis, "A Guide to the Literature on Statistics of Religious Affiliation with References to Related Social Studies," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, Volume 54, June 1959, pp. 335-357.

debated the relative merits of a Census of Religious Bodies as over against a question on religious affiliation or preference to be asked in the Census of Population. Late in the 1940's the Bureau received a number of suggestions that a question on religion be included in the 1950 Census. After some discussion the Acting Director of the Bureau issued an announcement stating that such a question would not be included. The statement said, in part:

"It is our conclusion then that in view of the controversial nature of the question, the intense opposition to it in certain quarters, and the doubtful reliability of the information collected, it therefore seems unwise to jeopardize the success of the whole decennial census in order to obtain the admittedly useful information on religious affiliation. It seems that the issue can be faced more squarely in the proposed Census of Religious Bodies for 1956, in which there is not the additional complication of a general census and in which at least some objective criteria of affiliation are possible."

Early in the 1950's, proponents of including such a question renewed their pleas. In 1956, the Director of the Bureau announced that a question on religion was under consideration for the 1960 Census, and stated the conditions under which such a question might gain acceptance. It was hoped that the announcement would help bring the subject into wide public discussion. One concrete proposal came in an editorial in the Catholic magazine, *America* which recommended three questions: With what religion are you affiliated? Do you regularly attend church or synagogue? Do you believe in God? The last of these three was immediately ruled out by the Bureau, as it had been when it was proposed prior to the 1950 Census. The second question was also ruled out as unsuited to a statistical inquiry such as a census.

One element which entered into discussion was the fact that replies to census questions are mandatory. It was suggested by some of the proponents of a question on religion that this one should be exempted from the mandatory provisions in the belief that voluntary response to such a question would remove much of the objection which had been raised. Such an arrangement would have required Congressional action to amend the Census Law. The position of the Bureau of the Census was that having part of the census on a mandatory basis and another part on a voluntary basis would create administrative problems of so serious a nature that no such amendment should be sought. The Census of Population had been taken under laws which required respondents to give the information since 1790, and there were good reasons why such a requirement should be continued.

That the public by and large was willing to reply to a question on religion on a voluntary basis had been demonstrated in response to the question: What is your religion?—which had been included in the Current Population Survey in March 1957. This is a voluntary survey, which at that time involved about 35,000 households. There was almost no opposition to the question on the part of the respondents. This experience is consistent with that of private survey organizations which have asked such a question on numerous occasions. Press reactions to the Bureau's survey were mixed, as were the reactions from spokesmen of interested organizations.

Public discussion continued and by late 1957 it seemed clear to the Director of the Census that it would not be feasible to include a question on religion in the 1960 Census. In December of that year an official announcement was issued stating that the 1960 Census of Population would not include an inquiry on religion.

The primary reason given was: "... (The)

recognition that at this time a considerable number of persons would be reluctant to answer such a question in the census where a reply is mandatory. Under the circumstances it was not believed that the value of the statistics based on the question would be great enough to justify overriding such an attitude. Cost factors also were a consideration."

When work began on the plans for the 1970 Census, consideration was again given to the inclusion of a question on religion. Among the proponents was the Committee on Population Statistics of the Population Association of America. In transmitting its recommendations to the Bureau it reiterated the report of a task force of that Association, which had prepared its report in 1957. It had concluded in favor of such a question in terms of the research uses of the data. The statement cites the following:

"Research uses of census data on religion. A census inquiry on religion would be of great value to social research. From a sociological viewpoint religion is perhaps the most significant social characteristic that is not now included in the census."

"Thus, with reference to the major social groupings usually covered in sociological analysis, the census now includes information on the population of political divisions; the size and structure of the community; age and sex categories; marital and family status; racial and ethnic groups; educational achievement; occupational and professional groups; and a whole range of materials on socio-economic status. The size and distribution of political groups and political preferences are determinable from the elaborate machinery of registration and election. In this galaxy of information data on religious groupings are conspicuously absent."

"Among the types of institutions that have indicated need for religious data for research and administrative purposes are the following: religious bodies; health and medical insurance organizations; public health agencies; hospitals; charitable and other community services; school authorities; administrators of colleges and universities; metropolitan and city planning agencies; marketing research, social survey, and public opinion polling agencies; and official commissions on discrimination."

"To give a specific illustration: Scientific data strongly suggest that there are marked variations in health and medical care with religio-cultural patterns of the population. It has been shown that there are variations in the frequency of cancer and of coronary disease among religio-cultural groups and that the frequency with which a doctor is consulted also varies among such groups."

"Knowledge of the socio-religious characteristics of the population would contribute greatly to research in these areas. It would aid in the formulation of hypotheses concerning the etiology of disease and in distinguishing between biological and environmental factors contributing to the production of disease."

"There are parallel uses for religious data in many other fields. While it is impossible to forecast all of the myriad uses to which census data on religion might be put, the following may indicate some of the principal and more frequently expressed needs:

"(a) Analysis of size and geographical distribution of religious denominations, especially with reference to such matters as the degree of ecological concentration."

"(b) The study of differences in the characteristics of the population with respect to religion, in relation to occupation and economic level, years of schooling, racial and ethnic background, mobility, etc."

"(c) Analysis of fertility by religion. The importance of religion as a factor affecting differences in fertility, and in social and psychological attitudes regarding family size, has been indicated in a number of recent important studies."

"(d) Provision of information for drawing sample areas in surveys in which the religion dimension is important. The accuracy of many public opinion surveys and social surveys could be improved if better information on the size and distribution of religious denominations were available."

"(e) Establishment of a base line for determining future changes in the size and geographical distribution of religious groups."

The National Catholic Welfare Conference has been one of the strong advocates for a question on religion in the census. Its General Secretary, Paul F. Tanner, in testimony before the Subcommittee on Census and Statistics of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee in August 1966, said in part:

"First, statistical information about religious affiliation is helpful to both commercial enterprises and public and private welfare agencies in projecting services to the citizenry. As such this information would serve a valuable public purpose."

"Second, a sense of the history of preparing for the decennial census leads to the expectation that there will again be a public discussion on the inclusion of a question on religion. It is my hope that these observations will help to contribute to a reasonable discussion."

"Many commercial and welfare interests can be served by statistics about religious affiliation. In industrial and commercial circles it is well known that markets are influenced by the religious affiliation of prospective customers. The construction industry is an obvious case in point. So too the advertising industry, food processors, and the media of communications. Market analyses in these and other areas would be more complete—and better suited to the needs of the citizenry—if they incorporated projections based on statistics on religious affiliation."

"In the field of welfare services religious organizations play a significant role. For example, they provide medical and health services in their hospitals, social work services to the indigent, special training for the retarded and handicapped, and general education to children at all levels of instruction. These services benefit the common-weal and relieve public agencies of many burdens, but the significant factor here is that the existence of these services directly affect the welfare services of public agencies. It is by no means an uncommon practice at the present for civic administrators to obtain information about the plans and projections of church administrators. Consider particularly the construction and staffing of hospitals, assistance to the poor, marriage counseling, working with youth. A knowledge of the service rendered by religious agencies has resulted in better utilization of public resources."

"The current War on Poverty is another example of public service. The presence of religious resources is directly related in the denominational character of the neighborhood. Yet, because these religious agencies serve the public at large, irrespective of religious affiliation, public agencies are better enabled to direct their resources to other areas of need."

"This pattern of coordination in long-established neighborhoods appears even more important in the ever burgeoning suburbs. Projections on the religious affiliation of the residents of these new communities will definitely be indicators of the resources private agencies will provide to those communities. It is a matter of common sense, as well as fiscal prudence, that realistic projections of welfare services, public and private, will foster maximum utilization of resources and more widespread benefits to the citizenry."

"In effect, therefore, a census on religious affiliation has as its purpose the securing of

information that will benefit the people as a whole."

During early 1966 the Bureau held a series of meetings with users of census data throughout the country to discuss needs in connection with the 1970 Census and receive reactions to proposed new questions and tabulations. Members of the Bureau staff also participated in meetings with organizations which had an interest in the census. Consultations were held with regular and special advisory committees. Comments were received from many other sources, including editorial comment, resolutions of interested organizations and letters from individuals.

It became clear that while there was strong support, there was also strong opposition. Some religious organizations vigorously supported the inclusion of such a question while others opposed it just as vigorously and still others were uncommitted. It was concluded that the question might jeopardize the success of the census. On November 16, 1966, the Director of the Bureau announced that the 1970 Census will not include a question on religion. In this announcement, he pointed out that:

"The Bureau has been considering a number of requests from individuals and organizations which proposed that a question on religion be added to the nationwide census which is to be taken beginning in April 1970. The decision not to add this question is based on the fact that a substantial number of persons again expressed an extremely strong belief that asking such a question in the Decennial Population Census, in which replies are mandatory, would infringe upon the traditional separation of church and state.

"Persons who proposed the religious question stressed the importance of religion in many aspects of American life and called attention to the fact that such a question is included in a number of national censuses including those of Canada and Australia. Similar reasons both for and against were presented during the planning of the Censuses of 1950 and 1960."

Proponents of the question had argued that religious affiliation or preference is an important variable in explaining much of social behavior. Recent studies of the fertility of American women, for example, had demonstrated a major relationship of religious affiliation and practice to fertility. The information would be of value to religious leaders, sociologists, demographers, educators, and historians, as well as other scholars and research workers. Recently enacted laws to assure equal opportunity for all specifically mentioned religion, and information on this subject would be needed to measure how effectively the intent of these laws was being met. It was argued that religion is a significant characteristic of the population and that any meaningful descriptions of the population needs to include it. The information was needed for effective planning for educational, health, welfare and other community services; it would be of value also to religious leaders, politicians and certain business groups. It was pointed out also that the question is asked in the censuses of many countries, including Canada, Australia and New Zealand. Although technicians might debate the meaning to be given to the answers to the question: What is your religion?—the respondents apparently had no such difficulty. The fact that in most instances the persons identifying themselves with a religious group were more numerous than the claimed membership was not viewed as a serious limitation on the utility of the resulting data.

Article VI of the Constitution, which prohibits the Congress from requiring a religious test as a qualification for any office on public trust under the United States, is not deemed relevant to the issue, for the information collected in a census cannot be used for or against the individual to whom it relates.

Similarly, the First Amendment to the Constitution does not appear to apply, for it refers to the establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, and makes no reference to the collection of information about religious preference or affiliation.

The arguments against the inclusion of such a question revolved chiefly around the apparent violation of the doctrine of the separation of church and state and the correlated issue of the invasion of privacy. In a pamphlet issued by the Synagogue Council of America and the National Community Relations Advisory Council, the opposition was stated in the following terms:

"(1) The asking of such questions by census takers would be in violation of the constitutional guaranty of freedom of religion. The United States Supreme Court has expressly declared that, under the freedom of religion provision of the Bill of Rights, no person may be compelled to profess a belief or disbelief in any religion. Persons questioned by census takers are subject to conviction and punishment as criminals if they refuse to answer. However, even if the element of compulsion be eliminated, we would regard the asking of questions about religious affiliation or belief as violative of the Constitutional guaranty of religious freedom.

"(2) The asking of such questions would violate the constitutional guaranty of the separation of church and state; for it would, in effect, make the federal government an agent of religious groups and employ government instrumentalities for church purposes.

"(3) The asking of such questions would constitute an unwarranted infringement upon the privacy of Americans. In a totalitarian society no interest of the people is deemed outside the jurisdiction and concern of the state. In a democracy on the other hand, the state has only such powers and such jurisdiction as are freely granted to it by the people; certain aspects of the people's lives are held inviolable; chief among these is the relation of man to his Maker. In a democracy committed to the separation of church and state the religion of the people is not a proper subject of government inquiry.

"(4) The asking of such questions would create a dangerous precedent, the consequences and implications of which cannot be anticipated. For 170 years our government has refrained from including questions concerning religion in the census. Abandonment of this tradition would inevitably lead to further encroachments upon the liberties of Americans."

At least one denomination has a doctrinal position against providing statistics about its members. Some opposition was based on the belief that the information would be of value primarily to religious organizations and would thus constitute improper use of government resources in behalf of religious organizations.

Another line of argument which was in the background of some of the discussion related to the possibility of abuse of the confidential nature of census returns. Although all individual information in the census returns must be held in confidence, in accordance with the law, some critics have expressed the fear that under conditions of stress the law might be altered and the information on the religious affiliation or preference of individuals might be used to their detriment. The statement that such fears are unfounded and that the historical precedents from outside the United States, which are cited, are not relevant has not been sufficient to dispose of this concern.

So far as the 1970 Census is concerned, the issue is now closed. The need for the information remains; the objections to having it collected in the Census of Population remain. What further developments may come in relation to a later census cannot be foreseen at this time.

Following the conference of October 22 to 24, 1967, the Synagogue Council of America and the National Community Relations Advisory Council issued their statement on "Religion in the Federal Census," the text of which follows:

THE 1967 STATEMENT BY THE SYNAGOGUE COUNCIL OF AMERICA AND THE NATIONAL COMMUNITY RELATIONS ADVISORY COUNCIL ON RELIGION IN THE FEDERAL CENSUS

We are opposed to the inclusion in the federal census of any question regarding religious affiliation or belief for the following reasons:

(1) The asking of such questions by census takers would be in violation of the constitutional guaranty of freedom of religion. The United States Supreme Court has expressly declared that, under the freedom of religion provision of the Bill of Rights, no person may be compelled to profess a belief or disbelief in any religion. Persons questioned by census takers are subject to conviction and punishment as criminals if they refuse to answer. However, even if the element of compulsion be eliminated, we would regard the asking of questions about religious affiliation or belief as violative of the Constitutional guaranty of religious freedom.

(2) The asking of such questions would violate the constitutional guaranty of the separation of church and state; for it would, in effect, make the federal government an agent of religious groups and employ government instrumentalities for church purposes.

(3) The asking of such questions would constitute an unwarranted infringement upon the privacy of Americans. In a totalitarian society no interest of the people is deemed outside the jurisdiction and concern of the state. In a democracy, on the other hand, the state has only such powers and such jurisdiction as are freely granted to it by the people; certain aspects of the people's lives are held inviolable; chief among these is the relation of man to his Maker. In a democracy committed to the separation of church and state the religion of the people is not a proper subject of government inquiry.

(4) The asking of such questions would create a dangerous precedent, the consequences and implications of which cannot be anticipated. For 170 years our government has refrained from including questions concerning religion in the census. Abandonment of this tradition would inevitably lead to further encroachments upon the liberties of Americans.

The subject of protection of the right to privacy includes the proper uses of information properly gathered. It has been estimated that the data from census questionnaires is sold to Government agencies, private businesses, and anyone else who wishes to purchase the statistics for more than \$24 million. If block-by-block information on housing and population characteristics is available, the question arises as to whether this information can be used to exploit the privacy of the individual. If ZIP codes are also included, it would seem relatively simple to pinpoint information to a particular household. This certainly was not the intent of Congress in authorizing the Decennial Census and therefore the entire subject calls for reexamination.

The inquiry and investigation into invasions of the "right of privacy" has centered on such matters as wiretapping and electronic eavesdropping. The scope of the congressional investigation should be broadened and I urge my colleagues to support early hearings on the scope of the census and related "right of privacy" questions.

Imports Threaten Entire Textile Industry**HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN**

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the need is urgent and imperative to extend the long-term textile agreement to cover imports of wool and manmade fibers, filaments, and filament yarn.

The volume of woolen and manmade textile imports pouring into our country is threatening the entire textile complex and its 2,000,000 employees.

The following is an excerpt from an article by Mr. Larston D. Farrar which appeared in the January issue of Textile Bulletin which I commend to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress and to the people of our country:

IMPACT OF IMPORTS

E. Fontaine Broun, president of the Man-Made Fiber Producers Association, testifying before the Tariff Commission in its investigation of the impact of imports on the textile industry, made these seven points:

Establishments producing man-made fibers are part of the textile industry complex, which is the subject of the investigation. To evaluate fully the impact of imports on the man-made fiber sector of the textile industry, it is necessary to consider the man-made fiber content of both primary and secondary products. So considered, it is evident that imports of man-made fiber textile materials are now close to, or are destined to move above, the 10% level of market penetration in a relatively short time.

The interchangeability of use of man-made with natural fibers on existing textile equipment throughout the world has made the textile markets of the world interdependent, from a fiber point of view. It is impossible to evaluate the impact of foreign trade developments upon the domestic industry, or to achieve an adequate regulation of foreign trade in textiles, on a single fiber basis. It must be done on a multifiber basis.

The world, and especially Japan and the less developed nations, have a rapidly rising capability to produce man-made fiber textile materials. This capacity is being used on an increasing basis to produce goods for export to the U.S. The attempted regulation of textile imports on a single fiber (cotton) basis in the Long-Term Cotton Textile Arrangement has accelerated the shift by foreign producers from cotton to man-made fiber textile materials.

Large increases in the new supply of man-made fiber textile materials from abroad threaten the economic stability of the man-made fiber textile industry of the U.S., and the jobs associated with that capacity. The tariff cuts to which the U.S. agreed in the Kennedy Round will worsen this threatening situation.

Imports of man-made fiber textile materials have risen more rapidly than the growth in the domestic market, to a level disruptive of the domestic textile market. At the same time, U.S. exports have declined in relation to imports. A serious erosion of the nation's once major favorable trade balance in textile materials has taken place.

Rising imports have caused economic injury to the man-made fiber producing sector of the U.S. textile industry, as shown by the idling of productive facilities, an absolute loss in employment, a drop in domestic prices, and a sharp drop in earnings.

The use by other developed nations of quotas, frontier taxes, or antidumping measures to control imports of man-made fiber textile materials from less developed nations,

and the combination of man-made fiber producers in Japan and Europe into production, marketing, and export cartels increase the threat of economic injury to the U.S. man-made fiber producing sector of the textile industry. This is especially critical in the research and development and capital investment program, which has been the principal factor in the expansion of consumer demand for textiles and the strengthening of the economic activity of the U.S. textile industry.

A Tribute to Senator Joseph S. Clark's Labors**HON. JOSHUA EILBERG**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, as conscientious legislators, we labor long and diligently through the legislative process for legislation which we believe is good and necessary. The epitome of the diligent legislator who works hard for what he believes is right is the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, JOSEPH S. CLARK. For a long time now, Senator CLARK has sought realistic action on the disclosure of the private incomes of public servants.

Senator CLARK's long and arduous campaign has reached the first stage of fruition in the report of the Senate Ethics Committee. The Senator deserves recognition for his efforts, and recognition is given in the March 18 issue of the Evening Bulletin of Philadelphia.

In order that my colleagues may have the opportunity of sharing in this ably written tribute, I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at this point, the story written by Lawrence M. O'Rourke, Washington correspondent of the Evening Bulletin:

HOW RICH?—SENATORS MAY OPEN THE BOOKS
(By Lawrence M. O'Rourke)

WASHINGTON.—The U.S. Senate has started to clean its own house, and among those who can take credit for it are Senators Joseph S. Clark (D-Pa.) and Clifford P. Case (R-NJ).

When Clark several years ago started his campaign to require senators to disclose their financial holdings, few of his colleagues took kindly to it.

For one thing, many senators are rich men by ordinary standards. Most of them have had successful careers in law or industry before entering public life. In fact, the majority could not have entered public life without a substantial personal wealth to fall back on.

Senators are like everybody else. They consider their personal wealth to be a private matter, not gossip for the neighbors.

NOT LIKE EVERYBODY

But senators are in at least one respect not like everybody. They have to vote each year on legislation costing more than \$100 billion. They are in a position to do favors, for the little constituent and the big contributors.

It is because senators have the opportunity and bear the temptation to let private interest influence public decisions that they should be carefully watched.

Clark argued from the beginning that while he was not accusing any senator of betraying the public trust, he thought sen-

ators could relieve themselves of that suspicion by a voluntary disclosure of assets.

Clark made his own holding public, and the voters discovered he was a millionaire.

The voters also bestowed on Clark a second term in the Senate, perhaps demonstrating that disclosure of such facts not only does not hurt an honest politician, but can help him.

Senator Case also found voluntary disclosure to be a political asset. He has been able to challenge opponents to reveal their holdings, and Case has been the winner in those comparisons.

When the scandal involving former Senate Democratic Secretary Robert G. (Bobby) Baker erupted in 1964, Clark was given new ammunition. The Senate was badly embarrassed by the Baker scandal. And it was hurt further by the forced investigation into the finances of Senator Thomas J. Dodd (D-Conn.), who last year was censured for converting campaign contributions into personal funds.

Clark's effort to add a disclosure amendment to the congressional reorganization bill last year was narrowly defeated. And the handwriting was on the wall.

The Senate Ethics Committee, headed by Senator John Stennis (D-Miss.), began to work up a financial reporting system that could take the heat off the Senate by giving the public a peek at the wealth of individual senators.

The recommendations issued Friday by the committee do not go as far as Clark and Case might like, but they are progress.

The committee recommended that each senator file for public inspection a statement listing political and other contributions and honorariums in excess of \$300 for speeches, television appearances and so on.

MORE DISCLOSURE

Then each senator would file a secret report with the U.S. comptroller general including federal income tax returns, legal fees in excess of \$1,000, corporate or professional ties, property holdings worth over \$10,000, interests in trusts, liabilities of \$10,000 or more, and the source and value of each gift.

Senator John Sherman Cooper (R-Ky.), a committee member, said the recommendations were not broad enough. He said he favored public disclosure of financial interests and the amount of public funds necessary for the expenses of operating senators' offices.

Stennis said the committee sought "to achieve a reasonable balance between respecting the privacy of the individual and compelling a wholesale disclosure of all private interests."

It appears certain that the recommendations will become part of the Senate rules. Reasonable efforts to make the rules stronger, perhaps along the lines of full public disclosure advocated by Clark, should be supported.

The more the public knows about its senators, the more likely will there be support and acceptance of the collective judgment of Congress.

Fireman's Prayer**HON. LESTER L. WOLFF**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, March 16, it was my privilege to attend the annual All-Faith Communion Breakfast of the Williston Park Fire Depart-

ment. At this wonderful gathering I was presented with a copy of the "Fireman's Prayer" and I feel it is a message my colleagues would appreciate and I commend it to their attention:

FIREMAN'S PRAYER

When I am called to duty, God,
Wherever flames may rage;
Give me strength to save some life
What so ever be its age.

Help me embrace a little child
Before it is too late;
Or save an older person from
The Horror of that fate.

Enable me to be alert
And hear the weakest shout,
And quickly and efficiently,
Put the fire out.

I want to fill my calling and
To give the best of me;
To guard my every neighbor and
Protect his property.

And if according to Your will
I have to lose my life,
Please bless with Your protecting hand,
My children and my wife.

To Honor Dr. Enrico Fermi

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, this Nation will mark the 15th anniversary next year of the death of Dr. Enrico Fermi. Dr. Fermi is widely remembered as one of the fathers of our atomic age, and as a man whose great love for his adopted United States was reciprocated by all Americans who knew him.

Today, I rise to honor the memory of this Nobel laureate by introducing a resolution authorizing the Postmaster General to issue an Enrico Fermi commemorative stamp.

Dr. Fermi was born in Rome, Italy, in 1901. He taught physics at the Universities of Florence and Rome, where his researches in nuclear physics were of critical importance in the later development of American nuclear fission capabilities. Dr. Fermi received the Nobel Prize in physics in 1938, and in the same year, he fled Fascist tyranny by coming to the United States.

From 1939 to 1945, Dr. Fermi taught physics at Columbia University, and it was at this time that he was centrally involved in the Chicago project that developed the first self-sustaining nuclear reactor.

Throughout his life, Dr. Fermi exemplified the best in the scientific and humanistic traditions of Western civilization. His unique contributions to this Nation, and to the world, were recognized by the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission when he was honored by its first special award, now known as the Fermi Award.

Mr. Speaker, it is thus most fitting for us to honor the achievements of this great scientist, whom we are all proud to call an American, by passing the resolution which I am introducing today.

Xavier University Marks 50th Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, recently, the Reverend Gintautas Sabataitis, S.J., Xavier University, delivered a moving address marking the 50th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, and noted the significance of that event for us today. For the information of my colleagues, the following transcript of his address and an article from the February 22, 1968, Catholic Telegraph, are included in the RECORD.

LITHUANIA AND THE GLOBAL THREAT TO FREEDOM

(Address delivered at the special program to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the restoration of Lithuania's independence in Dayton, Ohio, by the Reverend Gintautas Sabataitis, S.J., Xavier University, Cincinnati, Ohio)

On February 16, 1918, when on the East, the Marxist revolutionary marches were accompanying the disintegration of the Czarist empire, and on the West, Germany lay prostrate in defeat at the hands of allies, the small, but brave Lithuanian nation set as its goal the restoration of its national sovereignty and complete independence. It was not an easy task, since hundred and twenty years of Russian oppression had strongly weakened the national fiber. Yet the Lithuanians rallied to the spirit of the past, when Lithuania, in the 13th century united as a nation, stretched its greatness through three centuries and an area that encompassed all the lands between the Baltic and the Black Seas. Today we honor that moment of Lithuania's national greatness, pay tribute to the courage of those who died for it, and show our respect to the national heroes who grasped at liberty as the most treasured possession.

Yet, is this moment to be only sentimental, commemorative and rather insignificant in this age of the future when dozens of nations have sprouted up throughout the world? The achievement of Lithuania's independence of 50 years ago has a great significance for us today. It is very relevant for us today because the process of realizing liberty and independence is not over. As many nations rose to national maturity through the achievement of the national independence since the turn of this century, with a similar swiftness the Communist revolution has been seeking to dominate, enslave and destroy entire nations. If this century is marked by the end of colonialism giving rise to the independence of many sovereign nations, this century is more characteristic by the enslavement of significantly greater numbers of world's sovereign nations. If any historical fact has clearly emerged during the past fifty years, it is the sad and lamentable fact that the Communist forces have spread throughout the entire globe in quest of oppression, terror and death. This struggle continues today in Lithuania, who is a clear victim of Soviet tyranny. And she has been for the past twenty four years. Our late President Kennedy had once said: "We shall never be afraid to negotiate, but we will never negotiate out of fear." I ask you today: What good will have the Communists shown in Lithuania? How can negotiations be meaningful with them, when they broke every treaty that they signed and violated every commitment that they have made! We, free citizens, Lithuanian Americans, are challenging today the Soviet Union to give back to Lithuania its most precious gift of

freedom, liberty and national independence. Let this be the test of their good will! Our voice today should be: "Let the millions on the Baltic Shores in Eastern Europe go free!" Let them show a sign of humanity by permitting thousands of forcefully separated families for more than quarter of a century be united.

Let us face the struggle in which we as Americans are engaged in today. If we pour billions of dollars every year in South-East Asia and expose more than 500,000 of our best American youth to the brutal danger of violent death in South-Vietnam, then I say that our struggle is greater than we realize. Every graduate school will face during the next year the loss of some of its best students because they will be drafted into the Armed Forces. Is this sacrifice necessary? Let us look at what enemy we are facing and let us be realistic about the global threat to freedom that Communism poses all over the world. Do we remember those tense moments when Russia was stock-piling intercontinental missiles in Cuba, only ninety miles away from our shores. Suppose that President Kennedy was not able to force Khrushchev to withdraw them. Suppose Russia had started to bombard our cities in the South and had invaded our shores. Would we not fight back with all that we have at our disposal. Then, how can we be silent when Soviet Russia has not only occupied but has oppressed Lithuania for 24 consecutive years. Let Fulbrights, and McCarthys and Kennedys put themselves in the place of tens of thousands of Lithuanians who were deported to Siberia simply because they loved freedom. Let these misguided pseudo-intellectuals find out what it means to be Catholic and free in South Vietnam.

What we are fighting today is what this country fought almost two centuries ago, when it declared its Independence from Great Britain. We are fighting for the survival of freedom. The threat is global. If you feel this threat is meaningless then put yourself in the place of a 19-year-old American College student a few miles away from the DMZ, whose leg was blasted off by communist mortar fire. No one has all the answers, but the threat is clear. We need a spirit of calmness, of stability and of a strong sense of purpose. There is no room in such times for extremism or witch-hunting. Let us support, therefore, our President in his determination to defend freedom from the enemy who has avowed to subvert it. Let us not give up the conviction that freedom is precious, for if the Communists would succeed in eradicating the notion of freedom from our own convictions, then their victory would be complete.

We, Lithuanian Americans, have a mission today. We must contribute our knowledge and experience about Communism to the calm, reasonable and wise decision of our government. Many of us can be living witnesses to the evil intent and destructive power of Communism.

Let us not give up hope today that Lithuania will be free. Let us not abandon any nation whose liberty is threatened by insidious subversion, guerrilla infiltration and all-out invasion, whether it will be elsewhere or in our own hemisphere. If we compromise with liberty elsewhere, it will engulf us eventually at home. Let us ask the Almighty to give us guidance, wisdom and strength and trust in his power.

[From the Catholic Telegraph, Feb. 22, 1968]
FREEDOM FROM TYRANNY STILL LITHUANIAN GOAL

U.S. Lithuanian Catholics were called on to help build unity in this country and to combat world Communism at ceremonies last week on the Xavier university campus marking the 50th anniversary of Lithuania's independence.

Speaker was Father Gintautas Sabataitis, S.J., of Xavier, who is director of the Lithu-

anian Information center, Chicago. He gave the sermon at a Mass celebrated for Lithuania by the Very Rev. Paul L. O'Connor, president of Xavier.

"The wisdom which we acquired from being the victims of wars and bombings must be contributed creatively to the better solution of our problems in the strained fiber of American society," Father Sabatatis told the congregation.

"We pledge today, with the blessing of the Almighty, to devote our best efforts to overthrow the already too long Communist oppression," he said. "Let us be convinced that Lithuania shall be free again. But let us also speak out to the conscience of the free world for those of our brethren who are oppressed and who cannot even speak of liberty."

"We must use all our resources and powers to make better the society in which we live today," he continued. "Our inherited Lithuanian culture is not limited to the yearly exhibitions of national customs and costumes on nationality days . . . We shall give the best account of our Lithuanian heritage when we shall direct our creative efforts toward solving the mysteries of tomorrow . . . We must be a constructive and powerful force in our society, building rather than destroying . . ."

"Many of us have known Communism by living under it and tasting its tyrannous oppression," he said. "We can understand the tens of thousands of South Vietnamese who are the victims of guerrilla warfare, insidious subversion and direct aggression by the Communists . . . If we will be silent, then the very bones of millions of the victims of Communism will speak out."

"We offer our prayer to the Almighty," he said, "that Lithuania may be free again, that we may invest our Lithuanian heritage to serve the needs of a better tomorrow, and that we use our knowledge and experience of Communism to build a stronger and better America, that she will continue to be a constant hope for those who wish to be free and a vital inspiration for the oppressed."

A New Status Quo in the Middle East

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the dramatic events of the last few weeks in Vietnam and here at home ought not blind us to the continuing crisis in the Middle East. Almost a full year has passed since the start of the series of events that culminated in the 6-day war. Real peace there seems not one bit nearer than it was last June.

It appears increasingly clear that a dangerous stalemate has arisen in the Middle East to replace the one that existed prior to last June. I fear that this stalemate is every bit as prone to violent upset as was the previous one. In any case, we must try to understand the full implications of the new stalemate now apparent in the Middle East.

An article in the current issue of Commentary by Prof. Shlomo Avineri of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem is a splendid effort in this direction. Professor Avineri, senior lecturer at the Hebrew University and currently teaching political theory at Yale University, makes an incisive and lucid argument for the newness of things in the Middle East. His article, titled "The New Status Quo" is one of the most persuasive pieces of in-

formed scholarship that I have yet seen about the Middle East.

His article follows:

THE NEW STATUS QUO

(By Shlomo Avineri, senior lecturer in political theory at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. Author of the book "The Social and Political Thought of Karl Marx," which will be published this spring by Cambridge University Press)

Most of Israelis were proved wrong by the Six-Day War. They had been wrong before the war, when most of them minimized the dangers of escalation; and now, nine months later, those among them who thought in June that victory would have the effect of establishing, once and for all, a lasting peace in the Middle East, have been proved wrong again. In each case, a closer acquaintance with the realities of political power in the Arab world might have prevented a good deal of frustration.

Prior to the rapid political deterioration, and the equally rapid military escalation of late May and early June 1967, most Israeli observers were convinced that although the basic tensions of the Israeli-Arab conflict were far from having been resolved, a more or less dependable, long-term stalemate had emerged in the Middle East. Ever since the Sinai campaign of 1956, according to these observers, an undeclared, pragmatic normalization had set in, as a result not of negotiations and treaties but of mutual recognition based on a balance of terror similar to the one prevailing between the United States and the Soviet Union. The Syrians, of course represented a constant irritant, utterly unpredictable and fundamentally bellicose, but all the other Arab states bordering on Israel had behaved since 1956 according to what seemed an intelligible pattern—one, moreover, that was aimed at avoiding a head-on collision with Israel. Lebanon was the quietest of all, never having been keen on radical politics. King Hussein of Jordan, well aware that any eruption of pan-Arabism might cost him his throne, had jailed Syrian-trained anti-Israeli terrorists, outlawed Ahmed Shukeiry's Palestine Liberation Organization, and, by avoiding friction along the border with Israel, was trying to consolidate his precarious hold on the West Bank and integrate the two disparate halves of his kingdom into one nation. In Tunisia, President Bourguiba had survived his call for realism and moderation in dealing with Israel. Even Nasser was slowly and astutely changing his order of priorities in an effort to curb both the Syrians and the radicals; while Radio Cairo exhorted the Arabs to unite and reform in order to push the Jews into the sea, relaxed Nasserologists in Jerusalem were patiently pointing out that such rhetoric should not be interpreted as a call to a Holy War against Israel; rather, it represented a shrewdly calculated act of statesmanship on the part of Nasser, who, it was argued, was shifting his position toward a greater concentration on internal issues and was not about to plunge into precipitate foreign adventures. Most Israelis, then, felt that even though the day was still distant on which swords could be beaten into ploughshares, the Arab world nevertheless was slowly, painfully beginning to recognize Israel as a fact of life. Israeli politicians and intellectuals, journalists and military men, seemed to agree that a precarious yet long-term, non-violent coexistence was slowly emerging.*

* It should, however, be pointed out that at least one prominent Israeli never believed in the ultimate deterrent value of the balance of terror in the Middle East: this was Moshe Dayan. Years ago Dayan argued that Nasser might unpredictably close the Gulf of Aqaba at any time; confronted with such a situation, the UN would utterly fail and Israel would be left totally exposed. The events of May 1967 proved Dayan right in this

And then suddenly, toward the end of May 1967, everything collapsed, and within a fortnight the Middle East was plunged into the third Arab-Israel war in two decades. What went wrong?

So many instant histories of the Six-Day War have already been written that it would be unprofitable now to make yet another attempt to sum up the reasons for the breakdown. But there is one element that should be pointed out, precisely because it is unique to the Middle Eastern situation and has sometimes been overlooked in discussions of policy decisions: the independent force of rhetoric in the Arab world. Nasser, it is true, played a very cautious political game in his relations with Israel in the period from 1956 to 1967, but his caution was unaccompanied by any diminution in the violence of his anti-Israel rhetoric; and it seems that when the chips were down, the Arab world was found lacking in the internal societal mechanisms necessary to prevent the takeover of politics by rhetorical outbursts. If, for instance, Nasser's demand for the withdrawal of the UN Emergency Force was aimed at bluffing his way out of a difficult situation, then it can also be argued that when the move misfired, Nasser was trapped by his own strategy, and by the rhetorical substance of what passes for politics in the Arab world.

Israeli spokesmen have found it useful to cite the wild statements of Ahmed Shukeiry as indicating the basic mood of the Arab leaders vis-a-vis Israel. This, to be sure, is an obvious oversimplification; under normal circumstances, leaders like Hussein and Nasser would be astute enough to ignore the rhetoric of genocide preached by Shukeiry. When, for example, Shukeiry was quoted before the war as saying that, "When the Arabs take Israel, the surviving Jews will be helped to return to their native countries; but I figure there will be very few survivors," most Arab leaders understood that such talk only bolstered Israel's case before world opinion; it is for this reason, indeed, that Shukeiry has been recently replaced by the more soft-spoken Hammuda (a man whose final goal, however, is not much different from his predecessor's). Yet during the crisis, when moderation in word and deed might have been most helpful to their cause, none of the Arab leaders found it practical, or possible, to stop Shukeiry. And whereas Shukeiry's tiny Palestine Liberation Army hardly constituted a threat to Israel, his rhetoric became a threat to the whole Arab world, for nobody was able to stand up to him, stop him, shut him up, or shut him in. As tempers began to rise, one feat of rhetoric followed another; pro-Western Jordan became as belligerent in egging Nasser on as "leftist" Syria; nobody was able to prevent Shukeiry from granting TV interviews in which he invited all concerned to be his guests for coffee "next week in Tel Aviv." Under this kind of stress, the distinction between "moderate" and "radical" Arab governments evaporated (as Cecil Hourani pointed out in his thoughtful essay, "An Arab Speaks to the Arab World," reprinted in the November 1967 *Encounter*). One of the tragic consequences of this may be that in the future, few Israelis will lend credence to any moderate Arab stance—moderation has proved to be a fair-weather phenomenon. One should not overlook the fact that during the crisis of May-June 1967 there was not a single voice in the Arab world calling for moderation, not a single leader or intellectual was heard urging the Arabs not to upset the precarious equilibrium.

To take but one example: whatever his other virtues, King Hussein certainly did not

diagnose; the prescience of his political insight, as well as his moderation in dealing with the occupied areas after the war, may help to explain why Dayan is now receiving support in Israel from people who have never been his traditional admirers.

act as that moderate voice during the crisis; it was, indeed, Radio Amman that castigated Nasser for hiding comfortably behind the UN Emergency Force. Since the war, to be sure, Hussein has been quite successful in presenting a favorable image to the West. Nevertheless, the paradox still remains: of the three Arab countries directly involved in the war, Jordan was the only one that started an unequivocal assault on Israeli territory—and this, despite repeated Israeli assurances that the Jewish State was not seeking a quarrel with Jordan.

There is, thus, very little evidence to sustain the view now prevalent in the West that those Arab governments whose posture is fairly pro-Western will also act in a more "reasonable" or "moderate" manner when it comes to negotiating a settlement with Israel. Certainly the history of the last nineteen years will not support such a view. For the truth of the matter is that the Middle East conflict has never, despite all appearances, been polarized on a pro-Western/pro-Communist axis. In fact, in the war of 1948 all the Arab governments then attacking Israel (Egypt, Transjordan, Iraq, Syria) were "pro-Western," their armies trained by the British and the French and in one case also commanded by British officers.

Unfortunately, it is precisely the attempt to comprehend Arab political realities in terms of the Western historical experience—or in terms of current American ideology—that leads so many observers astray. All in all, it is as ridiculous for State Department officials to talk about a constitutional monarchy in Jordan as it is for the New Left to enthuse over the "socialism" of the Syrian military regime. Spokesmen for both these viewpoints rely on a romantic Western tradition of wishful thinking, each person finding what he is looking for in order to sustain his belief in the universalizing capacities of his own ideology. Both propaganda and incomprehension gave rise to such contradictory and simultaneous descriptions of Nasser's regime, for example, as a quasi-Fascist dictatorship, a socialist system, and a "modernizing" state. Only a handful of observers have suggested that the sort of military government now prevailing in Egypt, Syria, and Iraq (and indirectly also in Jordan, through Hussein's ultimate reliance on the Arab Legion) has very little to do either with Fascism or progressive modernization but may rather represent simply the traditional form of government common to the Arab world until the end of World War I, when the British and French imposed parliamentarianism on the territories that had fallen to their mandate.

Under the Mameluks in Egypt, under the Ottomans in the rest of the Middle East, Arabs have been ruled for centuries by military governments; civil administration in these countries has traditionally been handled by just one department of what was essentially the military establishment of a conquering power. This sort of government, in fact, may be more familiar, more autochthonous, and hence more legitimate, prestigious, and functional within the traditions of Arab society than any other model—be it democratic or Communist—imported from Europe. And though it would be simple-minded to dismiss Nasser as nothing but a latter-day Mameluk, there is little doubt that what makes his form of government so acceptable to the vast majority of Egyptians is neither its military prestige nor its supposed administrative efficiency; rather, it is simply that form of government which is most familiar to Arab society and which operates within accepted historical traditions. After a short and inglorious interlude of foreign parliamentarianism, Arab society may again be discovering its true identity. This has very little to do with modernization; paradoxically, the most "modern" Arab state is the feudal oil emirate of Kuwait; anyone,

on the other hand, who has seen the incredibly plush luxury of the Syrian officers' Club at Kuneitra, together with the hovels for enlisted men which stand next to it, would be hard put to explain the sincerity of the socialist rhetoric issuing from the Syrian government, or—for that matter—the relevance of its efforts at modernization.

The traditional, reactionary structure of Arab society has remained unaffected by the successive political upheavals that have taken place in the Arab countries; the same Arab social class which today sends its sons to the officers' corps in Syria and Egypt did so under Farouk in Egypt and the old politicians in Syria. Algeria is an exception to this rule, both because the ruthlessness of direct French rule had the effect of pulverizing the old Arab social order and because of the Algerians were after all the only Arabs who really fought for their independence and achieved it by a revolutionary struggle; hence their army represents the toughness of a revolutionary mystique and not the routine soft-job elitism of all other Arab armies. Curious as it may seem, Algeria and Israel represent the only two revolutionary societies in the Arab-Israeli orbit.

But if Arabs have historically identified with military forms of government, they have paid a stiff price through their inability to react on an adequate level to political crises and international conflicts. For the fact is that in the modern world the traditional Arab form of government is totally irrelevant. Nor can the Arab malaise be traced back to the trauma of European imperialism on which most Arab intellectuals blame their social and political ills. In harsh truth, it was not the British and French who in most cases put an end to any purely Arab form of self-government in the Middle East. For at least six centuries prior to European penetration, the Arabs were ruled not by themselves but by a variety of nomadic military conquerors whose adherence to the Islamic religion made it easier to gloss over their foreignness. The Arabs were ruled by Seljuks and Ottomans, by Tartars and Mameluks; their commercial classes over the centuries consisted of Greeks, Armenians, and Jews. The basic malaise of Arab society has been its inability to evolve an overall social structure—the precondition of national identity. Their failure in the confrontation with Israel is thus not to be blamed merely on poor leadership or on defective policies: it is a failure that goes deep into their history. In the same way that Zionism, as a movement of national and social revolution, began with a critique not of Gentile society but of the lopsided nature of the Jewish social structure in Eastern Europe, so a parallel Arab renaissance may have to be predicated upon a prior rejection of some of the traits which have become associated with the traditional Arab consciousness. There is, however, very little evidence that such a structural rethinking is taking place among Arab intellectuals.

All this leaves Israel with a terrible dilemma. Many Israelis are experiencing severe frustration over the fact that despite the Arab military defeat the old political leaders, who were responsible for plunging the Arabs into their present catastrophe, still enjoy popularity and general esteem. That is, no rethinking of any kind seems to be going on in the Arab world, and the consequence may be yet another calamity when Arab leadership is again overtaken by its own rhetoric. But while everyone is now discussing the possibilities of peace, or negotiations, or non-negotiations, in the Middle East, and in Israel hairsplitting arguments are to be heard concerning the nature of the future negotiated boundaries of Israel, it may very well turn out that future developments will not depend at all on the outcome of an agreed-upon solution. Now, after the war, everyone is a rationalist; everyone expects that the due process of international relations will bring about the preferred result of negotiated set-

tlement. But unless something very extraordinary happens in the near future—unless, that is, the Arab governments show themselves prepared to undergo the agony of rethinking their relation to Israel—there seems little chance that any Arab government will negotiate. As for Israel, her insistence on negotiations is not a mere formalistic pedantry, but is predicated upon what seems, under the circumstances, a reasonable assumption—that only an arrangement publicly acknowledged by the Arabs will be worth more than the paper on which it was written.

But if this is the case, and if the chances for negotiations are slim, Israel will be faced with the task of settling the future of the newly acquired territories by herself; and this is a responsibility for which she may not be as fully prepared as she was for war. It may be, in other words, that the future boundaries of the Middle East will be determined not by any conscious decision, but rather will develop as a consequence of drift, of *force des choses*, in a manner similar to the post-1945 partition of Germany, which did not come about as the consequence of an intended policy but which was a necessity imposed on all concerned by a common inability to achieve a negotiated settlement. One does not have to be excessively cynical to remark that the unnatural status quo in Germany has proved to be more durable than all the Wilsonian rhetoric of the Versailles Treaty. Similarly, in the absence of a formal peace treaty, the present cease-fire lines in the Middle East may—frightening as it may sound even to most Israelis—solidify into semi-permanent borders. In that eventuality, political philosophers would be hard-pressed to differentiate between the legitimacy of such boundaries and that of the old 1949 armistice lines, which became solidified in precisely the same way and remained so for nineteen years. In the absence of a negotiated settlement, the status quo becomes the only tangible reality imposed on victors and vanquished alike, sometimes to their mutual detriment.

The old Israel, the Israel of pre-June 1967, is, in a way, a thing of the past. Jerusalem is a case in point: it has been "reunited," but it is also a very different city now, with a mixed Jewish-Arab population. Christmas this year in Jerusalem became a reality for the first time to Israeli children, who for the most part were used to thinking of this holiday in connection with some distant and unpleasant memories their parents had brought over with them from Eastern Europe. Israeli officials and intellectuals are already diligently learning Arabic, in order to deal with a social reality radically different from the one they had all come to regard as the norm. Even the Jerusalem Orthodox understand that along with the Walling Wall they have also become the recipients of a rather more ambiguous blessing: public transport in East Jerusalem on the Sabbath. All in all, the Israelis have made a remarkable adjustment, but even this is perhaps not so surprising as might at first appear. It is true that traditional Zionism was wont to underestimate the political significance of the existence of an Arab population in Palestine, and the Arabs have a valid claim when they suggest that some Zionists preferred to pretend that there were no Arabs in Palestine, or that ultimately these Arabs would not represent a problem. Yet despite all this, Zionism never envisaged a Jewish state which would not include a sizable Arab population among its citizens. After all, the UN partition resolution of 1947 assumed that about 45 per cent of the inhabitants of the projected Jewish state would be Arabs; it was only after the Arab attacks in 1947 and 1948 that Israel was left with a state with only a marginal Arab population. Now the challenge of living with Arab neighbors within the frontiers of Israel has become relevant again.

The state of Israel, as it emerged through the *force des choses* of the 1949 armistice lines, had learned to live with many anomalies, to internalize and rationalize them. For nineteen years Israelis considered it a perfectly normal and permanent state of affairs that their capital should be a city divided in half, linked to the rest of the country by a single narrow winding highway, right under the nose of Jordanian artillery, and that a strip of land ten miles wide should constitute their major industrial and population center. The Six-Day War has done away with the claustrophobia of the old borders; it has also bequeathed a legacy of new perspectives which may prove to be as much of a trial as the old anomalies.

In 1948, the Arab countries tried to frustrate a UN compromise resolution calling for the establishment of a Jewish state in a part of Palestine. As a consequence of the war of 1967, all of Mandatory Palestine is now in Israeli hands, and most of the 1948 refugees are now under Israeli jurisdiction. The Israeli-Arab confrontation may now revert to what it was originally, before the other Arab states intervened in 1948: a confrontation between Jews and Arabs in Palestine. The issue then will be whether Jews and Arabs can evolve some kind of coexistence within the country which both consider to be theirs. Israel has a duty to prove her readiness both to acknowledge and to fulfill the legitimate claims of the 1948 refugees for rehabilitation; the Arab governments are no longer in a position to veto such a possible accommodation, and Israel's sincerity in the matter is hence about to be severely tested. But the major consequence of the 1967 war may transcend even this, in that the final outcome may be a country very different from the bi-national state so naively advocated by some Western observers. Whenever two peoples are at each other's throat, one always hears it advocated that they be thrown together into one body, of course with due constitutional guarantees; the catastrophic outcome of such naive solutions has recently been all too tragically illustrated in Nigeria and Cyprus. But the new reality, though miles away from the chimeras of such well-intentioned but hardly well-informed prescriptions, may nevertheless have the effect of localizing the central issues involved, and thus of neutralizing some of the thornier aspects of the Israeli-Arab conflict. As such, Israel will then have little to quarrel over with the Arab countries surrounding her. That she is now in control of all of Palestine and of the majority of Palestinian Arabs is as much of a shock to Israel as it is to the Arabs. What must be realized is that six days in June of 1967 have changed the political realities in the Middle East as radically as the six years of World War II changed Europe. Unfortunately, few seem to realize this; because of the swiftness of events, consciousness, on all sides, lags far behind the facts.

What, then, of the future? Israel has to guard against a position of romantic chauvinism (a position, incidentally, which was recently repudiated by a most impressive statement signed by outstanding figures in the academic community here). What is more important, Israel has to face a reality which is so incongruous as to require completely new political and social vistas. It is not generosity that Israel needs, but a combination of hardheaded realism with a tolerance for different customs and cultures, political astuteness coupled with a readiness on the part of Israelis—as much as on the part of the Arabs—to do away with some of the sacred cows of the immediate past: a recognition that not all the idiosyncracies of the last nineteen years are to be taken as universal criteria or eternal verities. All this will be tough going, on both sides, but there is nothing in Zionist ideology—or in Arab history—to prevent the emergence of a solution within the new realities. It will soon be

a year since the war, yet few have recognized how fundamentally the Middle East has changed. All of us go on looking for solutions, hoping for negotiations to begin, for a rational pattern to emerge, openly arrived at by reasonable and soft-spoken diplomats. Few seem to realize that the new reality is already being formed by day-to-day decisions. Awakening from the euphoria of victory and the humiliation of defeat will be a slow and painful process, for the Israelis no less than for the Arabs. Yet the process has already begun, and its development must be closely watched.

The State Department Fumbles Again on Greece

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in this morning's New York Times calls attention to the "unseemly haste" with which the United States has responded in a friendly manner to the announced September 1 referendum on a new constitution for Greece.

The editorial, highly critical of our Government's seeming willingness to provide the undemocratic military regime in Athens with "prestige and respectability," follows:

APPEASING THE GREEK JUNTA

Greece's military junta had barely announced plans for a Sept. 1 referendum on a new Constitution when Washington volunteered an official "welcome" for this news. "We are further pleased," said the State Department, "to note that comments from the Greek people and the press on the draft of the constitution are being encouraged."

Washington neglected to point out that "debate" on the constitution will be carried on under conditions of marital law and that general press censorship will be lifted only for comments on the draft. With considerable courage, the leaders of Greece's two strongest democratic parties, George Papan-dreu and Panayotis Canellopoulos, have spoken openly in Athens against the whole bizarre procedure.

Nor did the State Department say anything about the content of the draft, much less indicate what it would take to assure the United States that the projected "return to constitutional rule" was more than an exercise for consolidating the colonels in power.

This blessing, bestowed with such unseemly haste, is simply the latest in a series of moves that point to one conclusion: Washington has decided to do everything it can to provide the Athens junta with the prestige and respectability it has hungered after since its *putsch* of last April.

The reasons given for this course are dreadfully familiar: The United States cannot risk a vacuum on NATO's southern flank at a time of expanding Soviet influence in the Mediterranean; the colonels are a fact of life and Washington will get more moderate performance out of them by displays of friendship than by maintaining correct but cool relations.

It is questionable, however, whether the Greek armed forces, purged of more than 200 experienced officers, could fill any meaningful NATO role. And it is ridiculous to argue that the United States needs the colonels more than the colonels need the United States.

To go along with the fiction that the colonels intend to restore democratic constitutional government is to fly in the face of

impressive testimony from Greek democratic leaders. These leaders may differ on many things, but they agree that resistance to military dictatorship is inevitable in Greece.

The United States will be risking not only its reputation and goodwill but an element of its long-run security if it becomes involved in the unsavory business of helping to maintain that dictatorship in power.

We Need Debate, Not Just Oratory

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the publishers and editors of Newsday for their courageous policy of addressing themselves to those issues and events uppermost in the minds of most Americans. The editorial of Monday, March 18, is another example of this kind of honest journalism and I commend it to my colleagues, as follows:

WE NEED A DEBATE, NOT JUST ORATORY

The 1968 presidential campaign is building up a head of steam. Sen. Robert F. Kennedy (D-N.Y.) has decided to run against President Johnson for the Democratic nomination; Sen. Eugene McCarthy (D-Minn.) is already in the race, thanks to his remarkable New Hampshire showing; and Gov. Rockefeller is debating whether to oppose Richard M. Nixon for the Republican nomination.

So far, most of the campaign discussion has centered on the Vietnam war, the inconclusive nature of which worries Americans regardless of party. While Vietnam is the major problem facing the nation, there are many other subjects that must be discussed by potential candidates if the party conventions—and later the electorate—are to have a clear understanding of each man's position and program.

America is faced with a vast number of difficult problems. Campaign bombast and oratory designed to win votes by playing on passions will do no service to the nation. Thoughtful and informative discussions on the issues can help rally the nation to the challenges which confront us. And, of course, the President himself must take part. He cannot wrap himself in the mantle of his office and stand to one side.

What are the issues that require serious and rational discussions?

First, of course, the war. U.S. battle deaths have reached the 20,000 mark and Vietnam has become the fourth bloodiest conflict in U.S. history. How are we to resolve Vietnam: by escalation, by de-escalation, by withdrawal to enclaves, or by a total pullout? It is not enough for any candidate to say "Let's negotiate." Everyone, including the President, wants to do that, but Hanoi does not. The candidates must provide specific alternatives and possible solutions, not just vague promises.

RACIAL CHALLENGE

Second, the problem of dealing with racial unrest. How is the richest nation in the world to eliminate the festering pockets of poverty in its ghetto communities? How is the country to provide equal opportunity and a decent life for the poor of whatever color? What needs to be done? How much can we afford to do? How quickly can we do it?

Third, the problem of crime. Month by month the statistics show a national growth in crime. Citizens demand safety on the streets and in their homes. How can protection be provided? How does crime prevention

mesh with the rebuilding of the slums where so much crime is spawned?

Fourth, strikes. Labor-management disputes have reached a point of no return. The giants of industry and labor test each other while the public suffers. Work stoppages have spilled over into the area of government employees, from teachers to garbage men. There is, of course, an answer. Newsday and former State Supreme Court Justice Samuel I. Rosenman have pointed the way by recommending the creation of labor courts to hand down binding solutions in cases involving the public interest. Now it is up to the candidates to discuss this problem and take a stand on the problem of strikes.

Fifth, youth's desire and drive to participate in public affairs. Today's young people are the best educated and most knowledgeable youngsters in American history, but they require guidance and preparation to help them share fully in the great challenges of the day. How to give them this special type of guidance and how to give them a meaningful role in our society represents a challenge to all candidates.

Sixth, the preservation of our environment—the protection of air, water and open space; the creation of adequate sewage and waste disposal facilities; the improvement of rapid transit and highway transit; the enhancement of the quality of education. To what degree can we meet these rising expectations? How will we be able to pay for these demands?

Seventh, the maintenance of the nation's financial integrity. The gold stampede has given the dollar a rude shock. Our spending by far exceeds our income. The fiscal stability of America must be preserved. But how? By tax increases? By spending cuts? By the creation of priorities?

These are the issues for which answers are needed. The candidates for President must provide the answers.

Freedom's Challenge

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of Members of the House the following speech entitled

"Freedom's Challenge." This speech, prepared and delivered by William Joseph Nadeau, "A" Company, 1st Special Forces Group, Abn, APO San Francisco 96331, son of M. Sgt. Conrad Joseph Nadeau, U.S. Army, presently stationed at Fort Bunkner, Okinawa, and a resident of my congressional district, was the winning entry from Connecticut in the Voice of Democracy contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary.

I have had the pleasure of working with this young man relative to his interest in being appointed to a service academy. It is heartening to see a young man with such deep insight into the problems confronting our Nation desire to serve his country. I am pleased that he has received a nomination to the U.S. Naval Academy through Senator Dodd and has also been authorized to take the examination to qualify for a presidential appointment to the U.S. Military Academy.

Let me take this opportunity to commend the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary for its outstanding service to our Nation through its sponsorship of the Voice of Democracy contest. This program encourages young Americans to learn about their Government and inspires them to exercise their rights and responsibilities within its framework. The speech follows:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

As a citizen of a democratic nation, I have inherited the liberty to determine the course of my own actions, which are subject to restrictions that are the same for all and are as few and liberal as the public safety permits. Thus I have the obligation to ensure the survival of this system as the major factor in this world. I owe allegiance to this form of government and am entitled to protection by this same government. In this modern democratic state, personal liberty exists as a recognition of the right of each individual, within limits, to do what he pleases without the constraint of his fellows, to go where he pleases, to work at whatever trade he pleases, and to own whatever property he can purchase. Restrictions on the individual by the state should not be more oppressive than necessity demands.

It is being realized that the modern nation demands citizens who understand peoples and cultures in every part of the world. It is my duty as a citizen of the United States to appreciate better the role of the American system in the international scene, and in order to gain such knowledge, I need to study other governments and varying economic systems, other societies, past and present, and the relationship between man and his environment.

It is my responsibility to add to the liberty, prestige, prosperity, and power of my nation. I have a deep sense of belonging to my nation and a desire to contribute to its welfare. My loyalty to the nation is exceeded only by my loyalty to God and my parents. I have a pride in its achievements, a belief in its excellence, and a respect for its superiority over all other nations. I am to understand the ties which hold our great nation together: political, racial, religious, cultural (including language), and historical. I must have the determination to work with my fellow citizens toward the betterment of my country.

My involvement in the affairs of the Union is needed to form a more useful federal government. My participation can be realized by different acts such as voting and presenting my ideas on matters that pertain to the country as well as to myself to the proper government officials. These men always welcome constructive criticism.

I strongly feel that one of my major duties as a citizen is to attempt to find out all that is possible about our federal government: how it functions, its benefits to me, and what I can do to make it a more effective body. Its effectiveness depends upon the political intelligence of its citizens. If I am ignorant about the affairs of the nation, I am not contributing anything towards the welfare of my nation, thus I am a useless and weak point in the proper functioning of the nation.

Voting for or against any measure, law, or the election of a person to office is not only a right and a privilege but also a duty. As a citizen, I must never let my emotions interfere with my selection. I must consider all candidates and issues carefully and deliberately before making my decision. And most important, I must believe that my decision is correct.

In conclusion, the freedoms that I have inherited through citizenship are too valuable to be neglected, so it is my duty to participate to the fullest of my capabilities whenever possible.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, March 20, 1968

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

In the day when I cried to Thee, Thou didst answer me and didst increase the strength of my soul.—Psalm 138: 3.

Eternal God, our Father, who art the God and Father of us all, grant that by the tides of Thy spirit we may be lifted into the blessed assurance that Thou art with us, that Thy grace is sufficient for every need and that by Thy living presence in our hearts we may meet our responsibilities with patience, manage our moods with creative faith, and master our temptations with confident strength.

Make us ever sensitive to the needs of our people and ready to dedicate ourselves to worthy endeavors that minister to the welfare of our Nation.

Bless those who struggle for freedom

across our world. Crown their efforts with resounding success that all men everywhere may ultimately be free.

In the spirit of Him who sets men free we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on March 18, 1968, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 14743. An act to eliminate the re-

serve requirements for Federal Reserve notes and for U.S. notes and Treasury notes of 1890.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON ROADS, COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, TO SIT TODAY DURING GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works may sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

VIETNAM WAR POLICIES

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House